A THEOLOGICAL INTEGRATION OF THE SOCIAL AND

PERSONAL IN PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSELING:

A PROCESS VIEW

BY

JAMES N. POLING

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

May 1980

This dissertation, written by

<u>James N. Poling</u>

*under the direction of————Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Faculty Committee

Chairman

Date *Sept. 18, 1979*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study is focused on the social and personal aspects of human experience. Social refers to the way individuals are related to one another and to larger societies in the world. Personal refers to the way individuals are free and unique in the midst of relationships.

A bifurcation of the social and personal in human experience characterizes the dominant views of human nature in the human sciences. Behavioral therapy places the emphasis on the social aspect so that individual experience is a product of the social forces. Psychoanalysis places the emphasis on the personal aspect so that individual experience originates in the drives and wishes of the biological and psychological organism. Neither of these theories gives an adequate explanation of how the individual is both social and personal.

Pastoral care and counseling is a ministry of the church concerned with the nurture and socialization of individuals, especially in times of personal crises. The field has adapted the theory and technique of the human sciences to the ministry of the church in ways that attempt to be consistent with the theological foundation of the church.

The bifurcation of the social and personal became a problem in pastoral care and counseling as the field was influenced by dynamic psychology. In the debate between behaviorism and psychoanalysis, the field has usually sided with the assumptions of psychoanalysis that the basic drives in human experience are the biological, psychological, and spiritual needs of the individual. By taking the side of the debate which emphasized the personal aspect of experience, the field has preserved individuality but has struggled with the social aspect of experience.

Chapter One analyzes the work of Wise and Johnson, two of the leaders in pastoral care and counseling, with special attention to their view of human nature. It is the thesis of this chapter that their assumptions about human nature result in a bifurcation of the social and personal, and that the consequences of this problem are seen most clearly in the doctrine of love. The gap between individual and environment leads to contradictions within the doctrine of love which cannot be resolved without changes in the underlying assumptions about human nature.

Chapter Two presents a process view of human nature which integrates the social and personal aspects of experience. This anthropology is drawn from the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead and the social psychology of George Herbert Mead. Process Thought and the related theological orientation provide new ways to conceptualize human experience which are helpful on the problem of the bifurcation of the social and personal.

Chapter Three tests the process anthropology in terms of the doctrine of love and other doctrines of theology. The integration of the social and personal provides a new perspective for understanding the work of love and the relationship of God and humans. This section draws on the theology of Daniel Day Williams and Bernard Loomer.

Chapter Four develops the implications of a social and personal anthropology for the field of pastoral care and counseling. The process view of human nature provides a new perspective on the context of pastoral care, pastoral care as theology, and ministry as the response to individuals in personal crises.

INTRODUCTION

This study is focused on the social and personal aspects of human experience. The word social refers to the way individuals are related to one another and to larger social societies in the world. The word personal refers to the way the individual becomes free and unique in the midst of relationships. The social and personal represent two aspects of the one process that makes up human experience.

The Problem in the Human Sciences

A bifurcation of the social and personal in human experience characterizes the most influential views of human nature in the human sciences. Behaviorism places the predominant emphasis on the social aspects of experience. Wundt, Watson, and Skinner have a view of human nature in which individual action is the product of social forces. Through the mechanism of stimulus-response, the individual is trained through interaction with others to respond in certain ways. The behaviorists argue that all human conduct can be explained and understood by this mechanism. Individual behavior is the result of cause and effect. "The most powerful reinforcers for a child or an adult are found in the behaviors of another person. . . . You are being reinforced in almost every interaction that occurs during your day."[1] A major defect of this theory is that individuals are totally determined by the environment, and the personal aspect of experience is lost.

---

[1]Gerald R. Patterson, Families: Applications of Social Learning to Family Life (Champaign, IL: Research Press, 1971), p. 11.

Psychoanalysis represents an alternative to behaviorism which emphasizes the personal aspects of experience. For Freud, the cause of human behavior is found in the drives and needs of the biological and psychological organism. Libido is the life force which pushes the organism to seek pleasure and avoid pain, and thus to form and shape its environment. Other people exist primarily as the objects for the satisfaction of needs for food, shelter, sexual expression, meaning, and status. Fortunately, other persons are searching for objects for similar needs.

> . . . the synthesizing capacity of the ego brings person and world together for the satisfaction of the person's needs and in respectful homage to the world, which contains millions of people constituted just like this person, some of whom may look at him as "outside world" and "satisfier" of their needs.[2]

A major defect of this theory is that individuals are determined by personal drives, and the world is external and accidental.

These theories, the behavioral and the psychoanalytic, represent the alternative of emphasis on the social or the personal. Behaviorism emphasizes the social aspect of experience by showing how the social environment controls the individual through reinforcements. Psychoanalysis emphasizes the personal aspect of experience by showing how internal needs and drives determine individual experience. Neither gives an adequate explanation of how the individual is both social and personal.

Many attempts have been made to solve the problem of the bifurcation of the social and personal as represented in the debate of behaviorism and psychoanalysis. Carl Rogers and humanistic psycholgists

---

[2]Paul W. Pruyser, A Dynamic Psychology of Religion (New York: Harper, 1976), p. 206.

are concerned that neither theory can account for the freedom and unity

of individual experience. Rogers has tried to show how individuals are

active in shaping their experience around goals of self-actualization in

which freedom and uniqueness transcend the limitations of past

development. Harry Stack Sullivan and relational psychologists were

concerned with the lack of emphasis on interpersonal relationships in

the shaping of personality. Sullivan has developed an interpersonal

psychology which tries to show the interplay between personal and social

development. Erik Erikson has struggled to introduce social factors into

the insights of psychoanalysis, but he has felt restricted by underlying

assumptions about human nature.

> In recent years we have come to the conclusion that a neurosis is
> psycho- and somatic, psycho- and social, and interpersonal.
>   More often than not, however, discussions will reveal that these
> new definitions too are only different ways of combining such
> separate concepts of psyche and soma, individual and group. We now
> say "and" instead of "either-or," but we retain at least the semantic
> assumptions that the mind is a "thing" separate from the body, and
> a society a "thing" outside of the individual.[3]

The point is that adding "and" between social and personal does

not overcome the limitations in the underlying assumptions about human

nature. Do individuals exist prior to society and then form relation-

ships with others? The crucial question is how the social and personal

are both aspects of the one process that makes up human experience.

The Problem in Pastoral Care and Counseling

For the purposes of this essay, pastoral care and counsling is

defined as a ministry of the Christian church concerned with the nurture

------

[3]Erik Erikson, Childhood and Society (2d ed.; New York: Norton,
1963), p. 23.

and socialization of individuals, especially in times of personal crises. This literature has tried to adapt the theory and technique of the human sciences to the ministry of the church in ways that are consistent with the theology of the church.

The bifurcation of the social and personal became a problem in pastoral care and counseling as the field was influenced by dynamic psychology. In the debate between behaviorism and psychoanalysis, the field has usually sided with the assumption of psychoanalysis that the basic drives in human experience are the biological, psychological, (and spiritual) needs of the individual. By taking the side of the debate which emphasized the personal aspects of experience, they preserved individuality, and with the help of Carl Rogers, they supplemented the freedom of the individual.

However, the writers in pastoral care and counseling have struggled with the social aspects of human experience. The individualistic assumptions about human nature have left them without an adequate theory of how other persons are internal to the experience of the individual. Their discomfort with the bifurcation of the social and personal has led to an attempt to emphasize the importance of social and interpersonal factors. Howard Clinebell has argued for a revision of the traditional models of pastoral care and counseling. "The primary focus of the revised model is on the between of conflicting relationships rather than the within of the intra-psychic problems."[4] This signals Clinebell's attempt to move from a strictly individual psychotherapy into a form of

---

[4] Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), p. 36.

pastoral counseling which enlarges the context to include significant relationships. It is his acknowledgment that personality has both social and personal dimensions which must be taken into account in pastoral counseling.

A similar emphasis may be found in Wayne Oates as he tries to assimilate interpersonal concerns into his theory with the help of Sullivan and Buber.

> . . . personality is relationship and apart from the interaction that goes on between man and man personality does not exist. As Sullivan puts it, "people behave in interpersonal fields." Roughly speaking a whole grouping of contemporary psychologists of personality define a person in terms of the interactions of persons with each other.[5]

These references to Clinebell and Oates are typical of the concern of pastoral care and counseling with the problem of the relation of the social and personal in human experience. It is the thesis of this study that the bifurcation of the social and personal in pastoral care and counseling cannot be resolved without changes in the underlying assumptions about human nature.

Summary of the Study

Chapter One analyzes the work of Wise and Johnson, two of the leaders in pastoral care and counseling, with special attention to their view of human nature. It is the thesis of this chapter that their assumptions about human nature result in a bifurcation of the social and personal, and that the consequences of this problem can be seen in the doctrine of love. The gap between individual and environment leads to serious contradictions within the doctrine of love. The problem of the

---

[5] Wayne E. Oates, The Religious Dimensions of Personality (New York: Association, 1957), p. 43.

doctrine of love cannot be resolved without changes in the underlying assumptions about human nature.

Chapter Two presents a process view of human nature which integrates the social and personal as aspects of experience. This anthropology is drawn from process thought based on the work of Alfred North Whitehead and George Herbert Mead. His philosophy and the theological ideas derived from it provide some new ways to conceptualize human experience which are helpful on the problem defined here as the bifurcation of the social and personal.

Chapter Three attempts to test the process anthropology in terms of the doctrine of love and other doctrines of Christian theology. The integration of the social and personal provides a new perspective for understanding the work of love in the world, and also the work of God and the human response to God.

Chapter Four develops the implications of a social and personal anthropology for the field of pastoral care and counseling. The process view of human nature provides a new perspective on the context of pastoral care, pastoral care as theology, and ministry as the response to individuals in personal crises.

Chapter One

HUMAN NATURE AND LOVE: THE PROBLEM
IN PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSELING

Introduction

Thesis. As a field, pastoral care and counseling is struggling
to move to a view of personality which is social and personal. With the
possible exception of Anton Boisen, the writers in the field are limited
in this goal by individualistic assumptions about human nature which
result in a bifurcation of the social and personal. These assumptions
lead to divisions and contradictions within the doctrine of love. In
order to advance, the field of pastoral care and counseling needs a view
of human nature which is social and personal and a doctrine of love which
reflects this anthropology.

Choice of Wise and Johnson. In order to show the bifurcation of
the social and personal and the resulting difficulties in the doctrine of
love, an analysis of the work of Carroll Wise and Paul Johnson will be
done. Wise has been chosen because he was one of the early and most
influential writers in the field. His work is typical of much writing in
the field. Johnson has been selected because he made a special effort to
solve the problem identified in this study. Relating the social and
personal was one of his primary problems, and he is very clear in his
philosophical and theological assumptions as he writes.

<u>Analysis of Wise</u>

<u>View of human nature</u>. Wise recognized the problem of the relation

of the social and personal in personality and indicated his desire to

move toward a solution of this problem.

> This organism lives within an environment which acts on it and to
> which it reacts. So close is this relationship between the organism
> and its environment that one scientist, J. S. Haldane, has said that
> "the organism is one with its environment," suggesting a kind of unity
> or integration in fundamental relationships within the organism and
> between the organism and its environment that is both very subtle and
> very powerful.[1]

Wise recognized that the social and personal were related, but his use of

the terms organism and environment presupposes a distinction between them.

It is this distinction which needs to be analyzed in Wise's material.

Wise summarized his view of personality in the following paragraph.

> Personality is the expression of the life of the total organism in
> its relation to its total environment, particularly in relation to
> other persons. Each person is motivated by deep physical, emotional,
> and spiritual needs which may be frustrated or satisfied. Wholesome
> satisfaction in relationship to other persons leads to growth and
> integration. Failure to receive wholesome satisfaction creates
> tensions such as anxiety, resentment, and guilt. Various psychological
> processes are set in motion to counteract this pain. When a person
> becomes aware of these tensions and seeks help, counseling may be
> in order. Counseling seeks to utilize the resources of personality,
> to work through tension-producing experiences and to help the person
> to grow to a new level of strength and maturity.[2]

Wise defines personality as an organism within an environment,

the most significant part of which are other persons. Organism is a

biological term which points to the psychoanalytic orientation of Wise's

---

[1]Carroll A. Wise, <u>Psychiatry and the Bible</u> (New York: Harper,
1966), pp. 6-7.

[2]Carroll A. Wise, <u>Pastoral Counseling: Its Theory and Practice</u>
(New York: Harper, 1951), p. 38.

definition. The organism is driven from within by "laws of its own being,"[3] which can be either frustrated or satisfied by the environment of other persons. Wise lists three such psychological processes which are inherent to the organism: satisfaction of needs, growth, and integration.

Most basic to the functioning of the organism is the drive for the satisfaction of needs. The biological needs for food, water, and other creature comforts are obvious. The body can function only if certain minimal needs are cared for. Less obvious, but no less important, are the psychological needs for. . .

. . . love, security, a sense of personal worth, belonging, achievement, and autonomy. These are inherent in the organism, as is the need for food. If they are not satisfied to a minimum degree, the results will be as damaging to the personality as the lack of proper nutrition is damaging to the body.[4]

Failure to meet these psychological needs will result in pain for the organism, first felt as anxiety, and then as resentment, hostility, and guilt. These negative feelings are the greatest obstacles to the mature development of personality. When the organism is frustrated over a significant period of time, these feelings are repressed in the person through "various mental processes such as projection, conversion into physical symptoms, rationalization, fantasy . . . physical illnesses . . . or antisocial behavior."[5] As such they become the basis for illness of some kind in the organism.

The second process inherent in the organism is the drive for growth. Again the analogy to the physical body is applied. The body

---

[3]Ibid., p. 33.   [4]Ibid., p. 24.   [5]Ibid., p. 25.

grows in a normal way into maturity unless it is interrupted by trauma. Likewise the emotions develop along a certain preordained plan toward maturity unless interrupted by emotional trauma. "Many if not all of the problems which come to the pastor are the result of failure in emotional development."[6] If a person receives the basic satisfaction of needs during childhood and later, the emotions will develop normally and result in a healthy personality. This will mean an absence of anxiety, resentment, hostility and guilt, and the free flowing of love and goodwill.

The third process within the organism is the drive for integration. There is a built-in process which moves toward the wholeness of the parts of the organism so that all parts "are contributing their particular function in relation to the whole person."[7] By the parts of the personality Wise is referring to the psychoanalytic definition of the person: impulses (id), conscience (superego), and ego. The impulses are the biological needs, the conscience is the need for social approval, and the ego is the conscious part of the person which strives to balance the needs of the person with the demands of the environment. When there is integration, the needs will be satisfied, the conscience will be relaxed, and the ego will be reality-oriented. Disintegration, or the control of the organism by one of its parts to the detriment of the others, leads to illness and death. In order for a person to be healthy, there must be equilibrium between the conflicting parts, and it is this goal toward which the organism strives.[8]

According to Wise, a person is an organism existing within an environment of persons. This organism is driven by inherent laws

---

[6]Ibid., p. 27.   [7]Ibid., p. 29.   [8]Ibid., pp. 29-32.

toward the satisfaction of needs, growth and integration of the internal parts into a whole which is compatible with the environment. When any of these internal processes are frustrated, illness of some kind results. Illness may be physical, emotional, spiritual, or some combination of the three. It may be as mild as a moment of guilt, or as neurotic as paranoia, but it signifies that some part of the organism is not functioning as it should.

We can see from this summary that there is a gap between the organism and the environment. Wise uses the terms inside and outside to talk about the relationship. He says that integration must take place in two dimensions: within, between the impulses, conscience, and ego, and without, between the person and the environment.[9] He speaks of the "individual's external relationships with other persons,"[10] and says that one sign of growth is whether the person "can learn to direct his affection toward objects external to himself."[11]

Wise says that the relationship between organism and environment is very close, that is, interdependent. The individual needs the environment in order to exist, and the environment needs individuals in order to exist. But there is a clear conceptual gap between the two. Individuals have their own existence, and then relate to an external environment.

Two Kinds of Love. How are persons related? Wise's general answer is that persons are related through love. Love is that attitude or behavior which enables basic needs to be satisfied in a social context.

---

[9]Ibid., pp. 29-31.   [10]Ibid., p. 125.   [11]Ibid., p. 153.

There are two kinds of love working in a relationship: self-love which seeks the satisfaction of one's own needs; and love of others which seeks the satisfaction of the needs of others.

Wise does not use the term self-love exactly as it is defined above, although it is implied in much of what he has written. That persons are motivated to seek relationships in order to meet internal needs is clear. Wise defines marriage as a primary relationship in which needs are met.

> Marriage is the closest and most intimate of human relationships. As such it involves a mutual sharing on very deep levels of experience, the mutual understanding and satisfaction of needs, the capacity to alternately give and receive physically, emotionally, and intellectually without conflict, and deep understanding and acceptance.[12]

Self-love is the ability to form relationships in which one's needs are satisfied at the deepest levels. Every person is driven to become involved in a relationship for the satisfaction of ". . . the need for love and affection, the need to have or avoid physical closeness, the need for security, for power, for belonging, for support and approval and many others."[13] These needs are inherent in the organism, the same as physical needs, and require that a person finds objects outside the self to provide fulfillment. To the extent that the person is effective in life and has a wholesome self-love, to that extent the person will become involved in interpersonal relationships in which these needs are met. The failure to successfully create such relationships results in frustration, anxiety, guilt, and eventually defense mechanisms.

However, Wise is clear that self-love is not adequate for the formation of good relationships because of the danger of using other

---

[12]Ibid., pp. 180-181.   [13]Ibid., p. 182.

persons for selfish gain without giving to them in return. A mature

relationship is one in which both partners experience the satisfaction

of needs. This can occur only if both persons also love the other as

well as love themselves.

> The specific source of marriage problems is to be found in
> immature and distorted attitudes. The person who insists that the
> marriage revolves around him and his own needs rather than in the
> mutual welfare of both partners together; the person who insists on
> the immediate satisfaction of his own needs and cannot accept the
> realities that require him to give as well as to receive; the person
> who looks upon marriage as an opportunity to be either overly
> dependent or dominating; the person who seeks to exploit his
> marriage partner either sexually or otherwise--the person
> representing either of these attitudes will find a great deal of
> unhappiness in the marriage relationship.[14]

Self-love, that love which seeks the satisfaction of one's own needs, is

not adequate for relationships. It contains the danger of egocentricism

and narcissicism which destroy relationships. In addition to self-love,

we need love of others. "To the extent that two people are able to

establish a relationship in marriage in which the needs and expectancies

of each find expression and satisfaction they will feel that their marriage

is happy."[15] Love of others is "an attitude that place[s] the interest

and welfare of other people on a level equal to that of oneself."[16] This

is a different love from the one that pushes one from inside to be accepted

and loved by others. It is the difference between giving and receiving

love. One is motivated by deep emotional needs to seek love for oneself,

but only by enlightened self-love to give love to others. It is at this

point that Wise attempts a synthesis of the two kinds of love. First, he

makes a distinction between self-love and selfishness.

> . . . selfishness is an attitude in which an individual's capacity
> for love is centered in himself in a childish manner. He then

---

[14]Ibid., p. 182.   [15]Ibid., p. 181.   [16]Ibid., pp. 149-150.

interprets the whole world and all of his experience in terms of whether or not it satisfies his particular needs and desires.[17]

Selfishness is the focus on one's own needs without awareness that other people in the world also have needs. Such selfishness usually results in the frustration of one's own satisfactions since few persons will become involved in a relationship that has no mutuality.

On the other hand, enlightened self-love understands that fulfillment of needs comes through giving to others.

> . . . as a person grows he can learn to direct his affection toward objects external to himself. Thus he learns to invest a certain amount of affection in his parents, his brothers, his friends, and later in his marriage partner. It is through this capacity to invest affection in objects outside of the self that a great deal of the development of personality takes place.[18]

Enlightened self-love understands that others have needs, and that mutual fulfillment of these needs will come as one develops respect for the needs of others. However, the true synthesis of self-love and love of others comes with the recognition that at the emotional level, the attitude one takes toward oneself corresponds directly with the attitude one takes toward others.

> Counseling does seek to help people to overcome their egocentricity. However, it cannot eliminate a wholesome love of themselves. What it does do is to help them to love other people as they love themselves. When they come to a point where they can accept themselves as they are, they also find they are also accepting other people as they are. . . . There is a difference between selfishness or egocentricity, and a wholesome love for oneself that is capable of recognizing others of equal value.[19]

Wise argues that at the emotional level of personality there is no difference between self-love and love of others. When one loves oneself in the best way, it results in a love for others which is equal to love for oneself. Thus Wise claims to have a synthesis of self-love and

---

[17]Ibid., p. 153.   [18]Ibid.   [19]Ibid., p. 154.

the love of others based on the way that personality works internally.

Wise's synthesis has at least two contradictions: one on the issue of motivation, the other on the issue of self-sacrifice. First, what are the motivations for the two loves? The motive for self-love seems clear enough. The organism is driven by strong biological and emotional needs to seek satisfaction in the environment. The organism needs food, water, etc., for physical survival and pleasure. The organism also needs a feeling of belonging, security, and status in human company for normal emotional development. So the person who has self-love will seek maximum satisfaction of these needs.

The motive for love of others is more complicated. On the one hand, Wise says that this love is inherent in the organism.

> We do not have to learn how to love any more than we have to learn how to digest food. Love, in both the sexual and nonsexual senses, is a natural expression of personality at its very core. When the inhibitions which many people pick up through their childhood experiences are removed, the natural capacities for love and affection soon begin to find expression. Instead of cold, withdrawing or hostile feelings, the person develops a sense of warmth, of closeness and a desire to be helpful to other people.[20]

Wise wants to say that the love of others is natural to the organism, that is, the desire to be accepting, affectionate, and willing to place the needs of others on an equal level with one's own. On the other hand, Wise says that self-love and egocentricity are natural, and that love of others develops only as it is socially learned and taught by the examples of others.

> There are many adults in whom this childish tendency to center all their affection in themselves is never outgrown. Their relationship to other people is constantly on the basis of what others do for them and never on the basis of what they may do for other people. . . .

---

[20]Ibid., p. 151.

A certain minimum of satisfaction to this impulse for self-love in childhood is necessary if people are to obtain a degree of love of others in later life. It is only as a child feels loved by those who are responsible for him that he gains inner freedom to express a similar attitude toward others.[21]

Thus Wise is caught in a contradiction. He wants to say that love of others is inherent and natural, yet he acknowledges that love of others is not characteristic of children, and becomes possible in mature adults only when they have received love from others and learned it as a pattern in their own lives. Wise is caught in this contradiction because of his assumptions about human nature. If organism and environment are split, and the primary life-force comes from within the organism, then self-love has a clear motivation, but love of others depends on a mature attitude toward others wherein the love of self can be tempered and/or postponed for the good of the larger community.

Wise wants to say that self-love and love of others is the same thing on a mature level. Does this mean, therefore, that love of others does not involve any self-sacrifice? Does the organism have to postpone gratification of its own needs in order to be open to meeting the needs of others? Is it important for self-love to be disciplined and limited sometimes for the larger good of loving others and building the basis of community?

On one hand, Wise says that love of others involves no sacrifice of the self. "The central point here is that as we feel toward ourselves we also feel toward others and as we feel toward others we will also feel toward ourselves."[22] That is, if we have respect for ourselves we will have respect for others, and if we have respect for others we will have

---

[21] Ibid., p. 153.   [22] Ibid.

respect for ourselves. If self-love is enlightened, then the person can

put the needs of the other on an equal level with one's own and thus find

mutually fulfilling relationships where the deepest needs are satisfied.

Wise does not speak anywhere about the need for sacrifice as a part

of love, but his description of the counseling relationship clearly

points in this direction. The counseling relationship is one in which

the needs of the client are foremost in the interaction and the needs of

the counselor are not involved.

> There can be no therapy if the therapist is using the client for the
> satisfaction of any of his personal needs, including a sexual need.
> Good counseling can take place only when the counselor has but one
> aim, namely that of helping the counselee to obtain a greater
> degree of freedom and fulfillment of his personality.[23]

This can occur because the counselor is one who has worked through

most of his/her negative feelings and thus has no blocks to positive

feelings for the client. Whenever the counselor has personal ne   , it

is imperative that these needs be met outside the counseling relationship.

Thus the love of others which is the healing force in counseling does

involve the postponement of immediate needs. "Love recognizes that

what we do for one another must be governed by what the other needs and

is willing to accept from us."[24] Self-love must sometimes be sacrificed

in favor of love of others. This is necessary because the two loves are

fundamentally at odds with one another. They arise from different

motivations and the tendency toward egocentricity is powerful even in

mature adults.

Wise attempts a synthesis between self-love and love of others

based on the emotional correspondence between feelings one has toward

---

[23]Ibid., p. 150.   [24]Wise, Psychiatry, p. 96.

oneself and feelings one has toward others. There are contradictions in his argument. First, there are different motivations for the two loves, and the motivation for self-love is obviously stronger. Second, love of others involves self-sacrifice and sublimation of personal needs which accentuates the split between the two loves and makes love of others more difficult.

Wise attempts to resolve these problems through his doctrine of God. In addition to being transcendent, God is "immanent in the natural processes of personality."[25] That in personality which is God is love. ". . . God is present in human experience when those realities which are a fundamental part of His nature are finding expression in human relationships."[26] God is that loving force which is immanent within personality and which moves toward the love of others. "Any experience in which we receive love in the sense of a union or belonging that over-comes our separateness may speak to us of the love of God."[27] Human love is a reflection of this divine love and makes love of others impossible. God has created humans so that the need for love is primary in psychological being. This means that humans are created with an inner craving for relationship. However, the gap that separates persons cannot be adequately overcome by self-love. Humans need an experience of acceptance and self-giving with no pressure to return that love in order to become fully involved in satisfying relationships. When children get such love from parents and other adults, they mature into healthy personalities who can also give and receive love. This is a paradigm of

---

[25]Wise, Pastoral, p. 37.   [26]Ibid, pp. 154-155.

[27]Wise Psychiatry, p. 121.

God's self-giving in Jesus Christ in which God poured out love on persons which was unconditional and prior to any worthiness on their part. God revealed the processes of love in Jesus Christ, and this love continues to be operative within the structure of personality itself.

Wise has provided a theological solution for his dilemma of the division of love. Since the impulses drive the organism toward satisfaction of needs, self-love has a driving force behind it. However, self-love does not provide a basis for relationships which are mutually fulfilling, nor does it support the development of community. Wise introduces God to fill the gap. What is difficult for persons to do, that is, to love others as they love themselves, is made possible by God. Through God's immanence in personality itself, love of others is given the support it needs to be equal to self-love. The example of God's love in Jesus Christ is lifted up by the Christian church as the direction of the natural processes of personality, and the working of the Holy Spirit makes love of others possible for persons who have faith.

Wise has provided an important function for religion in life, and can point meaningfully to the Scriptures as illustrations of God's action in the lives of persons. Religion provides support for love of others which needs support to balance the drive of self-love. The difficulty is that such conceptualization leaves the gap between the social and personal, and leaves a division within love which can only be cured by reference to a theological category. Given the serious problems that are resulting today from increasing individualism, it is time to look at the underlying alternative concepts of human nature which can provide new ways of understanding human experience.

Summary and critique of Wise. According to Wise, a person is an organism driven by inherent needs for love, growth, and integration, existing within an environment of other persons with similar needs. Relationships develop between persons for the mutual satisfaction of these needs to give and receive love. Self-love and love of others combine to provide the basis of mutual relationships in which needs are met. Wherever such love exists in human relationships, there is God, overcoming the separations between persons and creating the foundation for community.

There are two problems with Wise's theory. In his view of human nature he depends on a distinction between the organism and the environment. Individuals exist first with their inherent needs which must be met through some kind of interaction with the environment made up of other persons. There is a gap between the social and the personal which is hard to bridge. Second, this gap results in a division within love between self-love and love of others. In psychoanalytic assumptions the person is motivated to self-love through inherent needs, but relationships depend on love of others for which there is not adequate motivation. Whenever self-love and love of others are in competition, the main force is behind self-love. There is no basis for mutually responsive relationships and the larger social structures. Wise's solution of introducing God to solve this problem is inadequate. What is needed is a more adequate view of human nature which integrates the social and personal and reunifies love in human experience.

Analysis of Johnson

View of human nature. Johnson pushes at the boundaries of the separation of the social and personal with persistence.

> Interpersonal psychology . . . views life in a dynamic network of relationships and seeks to understand each item of experience and behavior in a larger context of continuously interrelated events, . . . of persons as participating members with other persons in the social interactions of community living.[28]

In the first part of his statement Johnson seems to describe the individual as an expression of the larger process of events without a clear boundary. However, his use of the word "person" in the second part points to his underlying assumptions about human nature. His philosophical belief that persons are the basic unity of reality leads to the view that the individual is primary and social relations are secondary.

> The general philosophical framework of interpersonalism is organic pluralism. Individual persons are real, yet never in isolation, always in relation to each other upon a common ground of interaction. This indicates a numerical pluralism of many selves in a qualitative monism of person-natured reality.[29]

He traces his roots to the philosophy of idealism through Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, to the philosophy of personalism of the twentieth century.

> Personlity is the key to reality. The Cosmic Person is the continuous creator of the universe and life. Man is a co-creator with God, and even while sustained by him, is free to choose and act spontaneously. The many persons are interrelated by the sustaining will of God, and the interest and responsibility they show toward each other. "Each person is a remembering identity, binding a multiplicity of experience into personal unity . . . [who] interacts with many other persons in social relations. (Brightman)"[30]

> The philosophy of interpersonalism is an organic pluralism of persons united by a Cosmic Person. This has been called personalism, but to accent the social relations of our universe we call it interpersonalism.[31]

---

[28]Paul E. Johnson, <u>Psychology of Pastoral Care</u> (New York: Abingdon, 1953), pp. 33-34.

[29]Paul E. Johnson, "Theology of Interpersonalism," <u>Sociometry</u>, 12 (1949), 228.

[30]Ibid., p. 229.   [31]Ibid., p. 234.

Johnson assumes that the center of all reality is personal, from a personal God to personal individuals. The world is made up of these persons, who are then united by the Cosmic Person so they can have relationships with one another. First there are persons, then there are relationships. Johnson has the same difficulty as Wise, namely, the individual is the primary unit and social relations are secondary. He fails to overcome the bifurcation between the social and personal.

When Johnson describes his psychology, the individualistic assumptions are clear.

> Personality is an intricate system of relationships whose focal center is a conscious I, the subject of experience. This unique self we have recognized as the "person" who is aware of his relationships through many dimensions that radiate from his self-experience. . . . At the center is the I who is actively participating in these dimensions of dynamic relations simultaneously. He is interacting with the biological, physical, social, and ideal relationships at the same time in complex and often conflicting needs and interests.[32]

As important as relationships are to Johnson, the "person" is the underlying metaphysical reality. "At the center of personality stands the person. This center of conscious experience has been known by theology as the soul, by philosophy as the self, and by psychology as the ego."[33] Reality is made up of "persons" who "have" relationships. The person is primary and the relationships are secondary. His diagram is a circle with an "I" at the center and four types of relationships forming the outer edge of the circle. First there is the person, then there are the relationships. There is a bifurcation of the social and personal in human life.

---

[32]Paul E. Johnson, Personality and Religion (Nashville: Abingdon, 1957), p. 233.

[33]Ibid., p. 235.

<u>Two Kinds of Love</u>. How are persons related? On the metaphysical level, persons are held together by God, the Cosmic Person. Person is the basic reality of the universe, and the persons of the world are united by the Person who is the creator and sustainer of everything that is. The divisions of the world are healed by God. On the psychological level, God unites persons through love. Here Johnson has the same difficulty as Wise. There are two kinds of love. There is the love which arises from the needs of the person, and the love which is necessary for healthy relationships. There is a division between self-love and love of others.

In a chapter called "Motive Power of Love," Johnson lists five sources for love. The first four arise from the needs of the person: instinct, dynamic need, emotions and responses, and affection. These motives for relationship with other persons are based on the needs of the organism for pleasure and satisfaction. Love is "a psychological interest in persons and objects that bring satisfying experiences."[34] Love is "psychic energy that responds to attractive objects."[35] Love "arises from attitudes and sentiments in response to the tension of inner needs and the stimuli of attractive relationships with other persons."[36] There is an inherent, natural need for a person to be in relationship with other persons for the satisfaction of need for ". . . affectional responsiveness--such as fondling and play in infancy, mutual interest in adolescence, courting a mate or developing friendly interest in maturity . . . ."[37]

------

[34]Paul E. Johnson, <u>Christian Love</u> (New York: Abingdon, 1951), p. 51.

[35]Ibid., p. 52.   [36]Ibid., p. 56.   [37]Ibid., pp. 53-54.

Love arising out of need contrasts with what Johnson calls the religious motivation for love. The motive for the love which holds community together and makes mutual relationships possible cannot be based on the drive for need satisfaction. In fact, there is a battle within each person between the lower loves (self-love) and the higher loves (love of others). "The basic problem of every ethical religion is how to cope with these overpowering impulses so they may not deceive or destroy but reveal and develop the best possibilities of which life is capable."[38] Self-love drives toward self-satisfaction, pleasure, and self-fulfillment, while love of others moves toward relationship and community. Given the power of the internal needs of persons, there is an imbalance in the motive power of the two loves. The problem is how to strengthen the love of others so that relationships will be mutually fulfilling and the social order will be strengthened for the good of all.

The split within love between self-love and love of others results in contradictions within Johnson's thought. The first contradiction is whether self-love can be used as a basis for healthy relationships or not. He rejects the analysis by Nygren that eros and agape are opposed, and that eros must be redeemed by God's agape. Johnson sides with Augustine that all love comes from desire, and that agape is a fulfillment of eros rather than a contradiction of it. "Therefore self is not denied but fulfilled in Christian love."[39]

However, Johnson is careful to make a distinction between self-love and selfishness, implying that self-love is only healthy when balanced

---

[38]Ibid., p. 59. [39]Ibid., p. 37.

by love of others. Self-love which aims only at satisfaction of needs

is dangerous and must be tempered by a mature self-love which includes

love of others.

> Self-love is the seed from which is produced the fruit of brotherly
> love.
>   But it needs to grow. If my love is fixated on myself, it fails
> to grow and so defeats the larger usefulness it might otherwise have.
> Self-love needs to outgrow self-centered fixation to become free to
> turn outward to brothers and upward to God. When our love grows up
> and out, it becomes mature enough to be filial and brotherly love.
> The self is not thereby rejected but rather matured in growing to
> the larger interests of social love.[40]

In the question of whether self-love moves toward love of others, Johnson

is involved in a contradiction. He wants to say that self-love is ful-

filled when it moves toward love of others, and that the energy of self-

love naturally drives in this direction. But he is aware that self-love

is often preoccupied with the satisfaction of needs so that it

undermines the love of others. Love is divided against itself.

A second contradiction shows up on the question of whether the

love of others is inherent in personality or a learned behavior. On one

hand he wants to say that love of others is a natural part of personality.

> To Jesus the major thrust of life is not from below but from above.
> The higher impulses to love as children of God are more natural than
> the perversion of anger, enmity, and lust. . . . He casts out evil
> impulses by confronting them with an overpowering stream of creative
> goodness (agape love) from the heavenly Father flowing in and through
> the awakening personality.[41]

He wants to say that love of others is as much a part of

personality as self-love which aims at the satisfaction of needs. On the

other hand he says that the impulse toward love of others must be taught

and learned in the social situation.

---

[40]Ibid., pp. 39-40.   [41]Ibid., p. 61.

Love is learned in situations where love is expressed. Human motives are constantly modified by learning through experiences of living with others. Early Christians confessed, "We love him, because he first loved us." (1 John 4:19). . . . The most difficult and distinctive of all motives in Christian love is responsibility. How does this develop? Responsibility develops from responsiveness, not inevitably but only when appropriate conditions produce it by effective learning. The sense of ought is defined and directed by social causes and effects as other persons act in consistent ways faithfully to express love and reduce hostility, by attitudes of approval when love is present and disapproval when love is absent. [42]

Responsibility is another way of speaking about love for others which takes the needs of others into account in one's own decisions. Thus love of others is not inevitable, but must be carefully taught. We are left with a contradiction within love of others, that it is natural and inherent in personality, but that it must be taught within the social context.

The third contradiction within Johnson's analysis of love involves the question of whether love of others is unconditional or whether it expects and requires a positive response. On one hand he identifies the love of God as that love which is given unconditionally regardless of the merit or response of persons in the world.

The Greek New Testament word for this overflowing divine love is agape. As Anders Nygren expounds it, agape is God's own love spontaneously flowing to all creatures, not by reason of their worth or merit, not moved by any gain for himself, not caused by any external force or value, but coming freely from his boundless generosity. Such love is creative, bringing new value to every object of God's love. [43]

Love of others, as defined by God's action in Jesus Christ, does not arise out of one's own need, but arises out of unconditional acceptance and regard for other persons. According to Johnson, love of others is a self-giving which seeks to meet the needs of the other

---

[42] Ibid., p. 61.   [43] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

without any return for the self. Johnson says that agape love is

possible on the human level and can be seen in the counseling relationship.

> Eros love is a self--seeking to enhance the status or gratify the
> desires of oneself. Agape love is a self--giving to enhance the
> worth and fulfill the needs of another person. . . .
> The more eagerly we seek to gain love by self-seeking the more we
> are caught in a vicious circle of malignant relationships. . . .
> Another kind of love is needed, agape love that seeks to enhance the
> worth of the other person in spite of his anxiety and hostility,
> without seeking reward but only to give love in the overflow of
> generous and forgiving affection. Wherever therapy is affective
> [sic.] this kind of agape love is present, to enhance the worth and
> growth of the other person.[44]

One definition of love of others is the love which seeks only the

good of the other and is unconditional in its self-giving. But Johnson

also claims that love of others is possible only when there is mutual

responsiveness. Love cannot exist unless there is giving and receiving.

> Yet, as we understand Christian love, it is more than pure
> giving. It is giving to invite a response. Does God love only and
> forever in lonely grandeur with no concern for the response to love?
> If so, it is contrary to empirical evidence and all we know about love.
> Such love is psychologically and ethically untrue. . . . Agape is
> redemptive love that invites a response of love. Thereby is love
> increased and shared in growing fellowship.[45]

Agape does expect something in return; it is not unconditional. It

expects a response which leads to creative relationship.

> The motive of creative relationship is different from
> acquisitive love of self-seeking and self-satisfaction. It seeks
> to satisfy and develop another through mutual devotion. . . . A
> Christian community cannot long endure if founded on one-way giving.
> There is need for mutual giving and receiving, without either of
> which the community fails.[46]

In Johnson's analysis there is a contradiction within the love of

others. On one hand it is unconditional self-giving without expectation

---

[44] Johnson, _Personality and Religion_, pp. 229-230.

[45] Johnson, _Christian_, p. 45. [46] Ibid., pp. 45-46.

of reward for the self; on the other hand it is the first step in the development of creative relationship in which mutual need satisfaction results. Johnson perceives correctly that self-love must be a part of the love of others if there is to be sufficient motive for relationship and community. But the gap between person and environment makes this unification difficult.

Summary and critique of Johnson. Johnson has described personality in such a way that there is a bifurcation of the social and personal. Persons are the basic unit of reality and relationships with others are secondary. This bifurcation results in a division within love between self-love and love of others. Because of this division, Johnson has contradictions within his explanation of love. Self-love moves toward the love of others, but it tends to be egocentric and selfish. Love of others is natural and inherent in personality, but it must be carefully taught and learned in the social context. Love of others is unconditional and expects nothing from the other, but its existence depends on mutual responsiveness. In order for these divisions of love to be healed, there must be a new anthropology which unifies the social and personal.

Anton Boisen

Boisen may be an exception to the generalization about the individualistic assumptions in the field of pastoral care and counseling. Boisen studied Freud and took his insights into consideration. However he remained an independent thinker, and balanced the psychoanalytic influence by exposure to George Herbert Mead. His social view of human nature and social doctrine of God are particularly interesting in this context.

We have found the basis of the human personality in the internalization of the group organization by means of language. It is dependent upon common response to symbols. The personality is thus seen as a set of social responses which have become organized and habitualized.[47]

Here Boisen reflects the influence of Mead. Personality is not a biological inheritance which is satisfied or frustrated by the environment. Rather, personality is a reflection of the social context, especially in its use of language and symbol. Boisen points in the direction this study will take, that there is a way of defining personality so that the bifurcation of the social and personal is overcome.

Boisen's doctrine of God also reflects the thought of Mead.

. . . the idea of God . . . is the symbol of that which is supreme in the interpersonal relationships and corresponds closely to what Mead has called the "generalized other." It stands also to the individual in the time of his extremity for that fellowship without which he cannot live and of which his system of values is merely a function.[48]

Boisen here points to the process view that God is an internal part of the world and of personality. The person, the world, and God are joined in a common process which affects each part and which is bound together for better or worse. Boisen is considered the pioneer of modern pastoral counseling, but in some ways the field has not yet perceived the radical nature of his ideas. He was able to transcend the assumptions of psychoanalysis whereas his students could not. With the rise of process theology, perhaps Boisen's ideas can be followed to their conclusion so the entire field can advance.

---

[47] Anton Boisen, Religion in Crisis and Custom (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1977), p. 216.

[48] Ibid., p. 64.

Summary and Conclusions

Many of the writers in the field of pastoral care and counseling have been aware of the gap between the social and personal and have tried to move beyond their individualistic assumptions about human nature. There is a general concern that persons be seen within relationships, and that counseling be directed toward the improvement of relationships.

However, an analysis of Wise and Johnson shows that the view of human nature in the field prevents the solution to this problem. Wise identifies personality as organism within environment in which the basic drives of life are internal to the organism. Johnson writes of the "organic pluralism of persons united by a Cosmic Person."[49] The result of these assumptions is a bifurcation of the social and personal in human nature. Individuals have a kind of independent existence within an environment to which they must relate.

The test of the difficulties with this bifurcation of the social and personal can be seen in the doctrine of love. The division between social and personal results in a division within the doctrine of love between self-love and the love of others. Individuals are separate and isolated organisms driven by internal needs, and self-love leads to the satisfaction of these needs. The person who is healthy is one who manages his/her life so that the deepest needs are cared for and the person can move to the higher levels of self-actualization. Love of others has no such driving force behind it, and thus there is no basis for mutually fulfilling relationships and community.

---

[49] Johnson, "Theology of Interpersonalism," p. 234.

The divisions and contradictions within love reveal the
seriousness of the problem of the bifurcation of the social and personal
in the understanding of human nature. What is needed is a view of
human nature in which individuals are internally related so that what
affects one also affects the other. Such a view of human nature which is
social and personal will bring healing to the understanding of love.

Chapter Two

A PROCESS VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE

Introduction

Chapter One described a problem in the view of human nature which is assumed in the field of pastoral care and counseling. This view is that the primary unit of reality is the individual, and that the social environment is made up of individuals who have relationships in order to meet inherent needs. The problem with this anthropology is that it results in a bifurcation of the social and personal that is artificial and which leads to contradictions within the doctrine of love. Given the serious problems that result from increasing individualism, it is time to look at the underlying assumptions about human nature. An anthropology that views persons as prior to the social context has led to problem of individualism. This chapter will describe a view of human nature in which the social and personal are not split, but are aspects of the same process. Persons do not exist prior to the social context, but persons are emergents from the social context within which they are also personal. Mead describes the task in this way:

> We are not, in social psychology, building up the behavior of the social group in terms of the behavior of the separate individuals composing it; rather, we are starting out with a given social whole of complex group activity, in which we analyze (as elements) the behavior of each of the separate individuals who are composing it. We attempt, that is, to explain the conduct of the individual in terms of the organized conduct of the social group, rather than to account for the organized conduct of the social group in terms of the conduct of the separate individuals belonging to it. For social

psychology, the whole (society) is prior to the part (the individual), not the part to the whole; and the part is explained in terms of the whole, not the whole in terms of the part or parts.[1]

The assumption of this chapter is that the person is an emergent from the social process, and that the social is internal to the person. Society is prior to persons, and persons are reflections of society. This does not destroy the personal dimension, however, because persons make unique contributions to society through the freedom to affect the social context. This is an anthropology in which the social and personal are both internal for persons. There are real individuals, as Johnson says, but these individuals are created out of the social process and have no independent existence apart from relationship to the social. Individuals are both social and personal in their very makeup according to this anthropology, and this effectively overcomes the essential bifurcation of the social and personal in human nature.

Definitions

The discussion of the social and personal aspects of human nature revolve around two key words which will be defined here. The key words are sensitivity and creativity. In a rough way these words correlate with social and personal. Sensitivity is the word for the social dimension of experience, the way that social relationships are internal to the creation of the individual. Creativity is the word for the personal dimension of experience, the way that the individual has a measure of freedom in response to relationships. Sensitivity and

---

[1]George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self, and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 7.

creativity refer to two aspects of human experience; every individual is both social and personal.

A brief note needs to be entered here concerning the origin of these two words. While sensitivity and creativity are common words, their use with the meanings used in this paper is original. Sensitivity technically means the ability to feel the feelings of others. It points to the way that persons are created by the feelings they receive from others. There are several ways that this term can be misleading. First, feeling is a technical term in process philosophy which refers to the causal efficacy of relationships. Therefore it has a different meaning than feelings as emotions, although it includes emotions. Second, sensitivity might be misleading because it implies that a person can be insensitive to the social context. While it is possible for a person to be more or less sensitive, it is impossible to be totally insensitive since the person is created out of relationships in a primordial way. Sensitivity is the word in this paper which means that a moment of experience is created out of the relationships from the immediate past. This word is not used in this way by Whitehead, Mead, or other writers.

Creativity technically means the ability to respond to relationships with new feelings. It refers to the element of freedom and self-determination that a person has in response to the social dimension of experience. A person is not totally passive or just a reflection of the social context. While much of experience is determined by relationships, there is always a mesaure of freedom in every moment. The person has some ability to create him/herself and to create future societies and relationships. Thus creativity is a primordial aspect of human experience. It refers to the freedom of the person to be creative in the world,

sometimes in significant ways, more often in trivial ways. But creativity is never destroyed, regardless of the limitations placed by the social dimension.

This use of creativity needs to be distinguished from Whitehead's use of the same word. In Whitehead's system of thought, creativity is the category of the ultimate. It is the process of the world which is expressed in every actual entity, but which has no reality apart from its concrete instances. Creativity is the many becoming one, and being increased by one. As such creativity refers to both the social and personal aspects of experience. It is the process by which relationships enter into the constitution of the individual, and by which the individual creates itself out of relationships and becomes efficacious for the future. In technical terms, creativity, as used by Whitehead, involves both transition and concrescence.

In this paper, the word creativity is used differently from Whitehead. Its use here comes from its more common meaning to refer to the ability of an individual to be creative with his/her existence. Thus it is almost synonymous with freedom, the ability of the individual to decide how to value relationships and how to form itself for the constitution of an occasion of experience. It does not refer to the category of the ultimate.

The reader should keep in mind the following correlations: the social aspect is called sensitivity and refers to the transition from one occasion to another; the personal aspect of experience is called creativity and refers to the concrescence of an occasion in its own subjectivity.

Thesis

The focus of this chapter is the exploration of an anthropology which is social and personal. Human nature will be defined in such a way that the social and personal are aspects of the same process that makes up the individual, rather than starting with the individual and adding relationships. The task is to define persons who are social by nature and which also have freedom of self-determination. How is it that humans have individual existence with its uniqueness, freedom, and responsibility, and also have social existence in which relationships to others are internal to the process of becoming? Such a view of human nature will be developed from the stream of thought known as Process Philosophy. The most influential scholars for this paper are A. N. Whitehead and G. H. Mead.

The thesis of this chapter is the following definition:

Human experience is a process of interaction characterized by sensitivity, i.e., feeling the feelings of others, and by creativity, i.e., responding to others with new feelings.

This definition will be explored by examining its three major parts: process of interaction, sensitivity, and creativity.

The Process of Interaction

Interaction is the term for the process view of reality. According to this view, the core of reality, including human experience, is a dynamic process of occasions rather than static forms. Forms are a part of reality, but they are abstractions which are secondary to the movements of the process. "Real beings belong to events and only to events. To be concrete, real, effective existence is to be involved in

a process of becoming in relation to other entities which also become."[2]
The word interaction is designed to characterize human experience in
dynamic, processive terms. Experience is a process of response to
relationships in which one's being is dynamically affected by others.
What is projected by the decision of a person in a moment of experience
is received into the feeling of the other person, and the response is
projected to the next moment of the first person. A relationship is
the constant exchange of feelings between persons.

Another way of understanding interaction as process is to see
that individuals are not static beings, but series of experiences.
Individuals exist for a moment and then pass their life on to the next
moments. What we understand as persons are really many moments of
experience which have enduring characteristics. These moments receive
from one another and pass their life on.

> As an occasion of experience, the concrete selfhood of the
> individual is momentary in its duration. . . . The life of an
> individual who endures for three score years and ten consists of an
> incredibly complex historical series of these episodal occasions of
> experience.[3]

Human experience is the dynamic interaction of these moments of
experience. Each individual moment affects the future of the moments in
its own chain of occasions, and also affects the future moments in the
occasions of others. Individuals are to be understood in these dynamic
terms as a chain of occasions in an historic route. Continuity comes in
the real effect each occasion has on others. Opportunity for change comes

---

[2]Daniel Day Williams, "God and Time," South East Asia Journal
of Theology, 2 (January 1961), 14.

[3]Bernard M. Loomer, "The Free and Relational Self," W. W. Schroeder
and Gibson Winter (eds.) Belief and Ethics (Chicago: Center for the
Scientific Study of Religion, 1978), p. 71.

in the individuality of each becoming moment. Everything is process,
and dynamic movement is the central reality of existence. There is
form in reality, but form passes away in each moment and is re-created
in the next moment. The underlying reality is the energy of the process
itself as it forms itself in one way, and then in another.

In social psychology, Mead uses the term "conversation of
gestures"[4] to refer to the processive nature of reality. A gesture is
any element in human interaction which has an effect on the persons. A
social act is a sequence of gestures, each of which serves as a stimulus
to the participants and leads to a conclusion of the act. Human
interaction is a conversation of gestures, an ongoing process of the
exchange of acts which have effects on each person involved in the social
act. Thus interaction is a constant adjustment and response within the
exchange of gestures.

Within the process of interaction are the aspects of sensitivity
and creativity. Sensitivity means feeling the feelings of others, or the
capacity of a moment of experience to receive energy from previous
moments. Sensitivity refers to the transition between moments of
experience. As each occasion comes into being, it is sensitive to
previous occasions and receives its being from them. Creativity refers
to the internal constitution of each occasion as it decides what to make
of what it has received, which Whitehead calls concrescence. As each
occasion develops, it creates itself out of the energy it has received,
and then passes this energy on to the future with its peculiar stamp of
originality.

_____

[4]Mead, Mind, p. 43.

"Technically, and in Whiteheadian language, relationality could be said to refer to process as transition, while freedom would refer to process as concrescence."[5] It is this dyadic interaction between the social and personal, which Loomer calls relationality and freedom, and which in this paper is called sensitivity and creativity, which provides the basis for a process anthropology. Each of these terms will be examined separately to describe how they function in human experience.

Sensitivity: The Social Aspect

Sensitivity is the word for the way occasions of experience influence one another, or how they feel one another's feelings. It is called relationality, sociality, physical feelings, prehensions, taking the attitude of the other, etc., by various writers in the process field of study.

Whitehead states the central question: "How can the other actual entities, each with its own formal existence, also enter objectively into the perceptive constitution of the actual entity in question?"[6] This question is based on the assumption that "Every actual entity is what it is, and is with its definite status in the universe, determined by its internal relations to other actual entities."[7] (Whitehead is using the term actual entity as synonymous with actual occasion and with occasions of experience as used in previous sections of this paper.) This he calls the "doctrine of internal relations."[8]

---

[5]Loomer, "Free," p. 86.

[6]Alfred North Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Free Press, 1978), p. 56.

[7]Ibid., p. 59.   [8]Ibid.

The technical answer as to how internal relations between actual entities are possible is as follows: "The answer given by the organic philosophy is the doctrine of prehensions, involved in concrescent integrations, and terminating in a definite, complex unity of feeling."[9] In this case a prehension is a vector of energy from one actual entity to another. Such a prehension is called a simple physical feeling. "A simple physical feeling is an act of causation."[10]

> The actual entity which is the initial datum is the "cause", the simple physical feeling is the "effect", and the subject entertaining the physical feeling is the actual entity conditioned by the effect. . . . simple physical feelings will also be called "causal feelings."[11]

A simple physical feeling is "a feeling for which the initial datum is another single actual entity."[12] Therefore, there are many physical feelings in the conformal phase of each concrescing occasion because every actual entity in the immediate past enters into the present actual entity by means of a prehension. "The novel actual entity, which is the effect, is the reproduction of the many actual entities of the past."[13]

> The physical prehensions from one actual entity to another are causal because they have to be taken account of in some fashion. The concrescing occasion has no choice but to conform to the physical feelings in its conformal phase.

> An actual entity in the actual world of the subject must enter into the concrescence of the subject by some simple causal feelings, however vague, trivial, and submerged. Negative prehensions may eliminate its distinctive importance. But in some way, by some trace of causal feeling, the remote actual entity is prehended positively.[14]

---

[9]Ibid., p. 56. [10]Ibid., p. 236. [11]Ibid. [12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., p. 238. [14]Ibid., p. 239.

Thus Whitehead has established a philosophical basis for causal relations between actual entities. Physical feelings are causal because they must be taken account of by the new occasion. "A simple physical feeling enjoys a characteristic which has been variously described as 're-enaction,' 'reproduction,' and 'conformation.'"[15] Actual entities have influence over one another because they are internally related by prehensions, or physical feelings. An occasion of experience feels the feelings of past occasions and molds its existence out of these feelings. Actual occasions of experience are internally related to one another.

Human experience is characterized by moments of experience in an historic route. As each moment of experience becomes actual and concrete, it becomes objective through prehensions which are causal in the next moments of experience. These prehensions are constitutive in the next occasions as they are received and synthesized into one complex feeling which then becomes objective datum for the following occasions. Human experience is dynamic interaction from one actual occasion to other occasions in causal linkage.

In Mead's social psychology, the basis of sensitivity between persons is the gesture. The gesture is "that part of the social act which serves as a stimulus to other forms involved in the same social act."[16] Mead illustrates this by referring to a dog-fight. The action of each dog serves as a stimulus for the other dog. When one dog acts, it causes an adjustment on the part of the other dog, which in turn

---

[15]Ibid., p. 238.   [16]Mead, Mind, p. 42.

changes the action of the first dog. Actions of both dogs have an effect on their attitudes and future behavior. "We have here a conversation of gestures."[17] Mead also refers to boxing and fencing as sports which are the exchange of gestures. Each sportsperson acts so that the other must adjust, and then each must adjust to the responses of the other.

> In this case we have a situation in which certain parts of the act become a stimulus to the other form to adjust itself to those responses; and that adjustment in turn becomes a stimulus to the first form to change his own act and start on a different one. . . . The term "gesture" may be identified with these beginnings of social acts which are stimuli for the response of other forms.[18]

Gesture is Mead's term for causal efficacy between persons. Gestures are actions which have a real effect on the attitudes and behavior of others. By his choice of the word gesture, Mead means to include the whole range of possible human behavior, verbal and nonverbal, intentional and unintentional, conscious and unconscious. Interaction between persons is a sequence of gestures, each of which serves as a stimulus to the persons involved.

On the human level, gestures have the potential to become significant. A significant gesture is an element of behavior in an interaction which has a common meaning for the participants in the social act. Such gestures enable the persons to develop sensitivity for one another, which Mead calls "taking the attitude of the other."

> When, now, that gesture means this idea behind it, and it arouses that idea in the other individual, then we have a significant symbol. In the case of the dog-fight, we have a gesture which calls out appropriate response; in the present case we have a symbol which answers to the meaning in the experience of the first individual and which also calls out that meaning in the second individual. Where the gesture reaches that situation it has become what we call

---

[17]Ibid., p. 43.   [18]Ibid.

"language." It is now a significant symbol and it signifies a certain meaning.[19]

Significant symbols are gestures which call forth a common meaning for each of the participants in the social act, and this enables the persons to take the attitudes of the other.

> We speak of this interest on the emotional side as "sympathy" passing into the attitude of the other, taking the role of the other, feeling the other's joys and sorrows.[20]

This sensitivity, sympathy, or taking the attitude of the other, is the mechanism for the development of the self. "The self is reflexive, that is, it can be an object to itself."[21] But Mead asks: "How can an individual get outside himself (experientially) in such a way as to become an object to himself?"[22] This is possible through taking the attitudes of others.

> The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs.[23]

The individual, through sensitivity, takes the attitudes of others, and from their perspective, develops a view of his/her own participation in the social process. The self develops as one participates in the conversation of gestures, and over a long period of development, learns to have a stable view of him/herself. "The self, as that which can be an object to itself, is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience."[24] Through sensitivity to others, the person develops

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[20]George Herbert Mead, On Social Psychology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 33.

[21]Mead, Mind, p. 136.   [22]Ibid., p. 138.   [23]Ibid.   [24]Ibid., p. 140.

self-consciousness. Such self-consciousness is consciousness of the self

as a member of a social group.

> So the self reaches its full development by organizing these individual
> attitudes of others into the organized social or group attitudes, and
> by thus becoming an individual reflection of the general systematic
> pattern of social or group behavior in which it and the others are all
> involved. . . .[25]

> What goes to make up the organized self is the organization of the
> attitudes which are common to the group. A person is a personality
> because he belongs to a community, because he takes over the
> institutions of that community into his own conduct.[26]

This social part of the self, Mead calls the "me." ". . . the 'me'

is the organized set of attitudes of others which one himself assumes."[27]

Such a "me" is social because it arises from the conversation of gestures

wherein the person learns to take the attitudes of others. It makes

possible consciousness of the self which is the essence of being a self.

> Our contention is that mind can never find expression, and could
> never have come into existence at all, except in terms of a social
> environment; that an organized set or pattern of social relations
> and interactions (especially those of communication by means of
> gestures functioning as significant symbols and thus creating a
> universe of discourse) is necessarily presupposed by it and involved
> in its nature.[28]

According to Mead the basis of all interaction between persons is

the conversation of gestures. Gestures are behaviors which have causal

efficacy in human relationships. It is through gestures that persons have

real effect on one another. On the human level, gestures become

significant symbols when they come to have common meaning for all the

participants in a social act or a social group. These significant gestures

then enable persons to feel one another's feelings, to take the attitudes

of others. The result of this mechanism of taking the attitude of the

---

[25]Ibid., p. 158.   [26]Ibid., p. 162.   [27]Ibid., p. 175.   [28]Ibid., p. 223.

other is the development of the self. The self is the ability of the

person to see him/herself from the perspective of the other, which, over

a period of time, results in a stable self-image. Thus the internal

relationships between persons provide the origin of self-consciousness,

the essence of the self. Human beings are social, both in their very

existence, and in the development of a self which enables them to

transcend the self.

In summary, sensitivity is the characteristic of human existence

in which relationships are internal to the constitution of experience.

> The concept of the communal and relational self means, in short,
> that we are what and who we are largely because of what we have been
> given by others, including our past selves, and because of what we have
> absorbed from others. It means that we create each other, that we are
> quite literally derived from each other. Within this organismic
> process of mutual creation we feed upon each other phsychologically,
> intellectually, and spiritually, much as we feed upon other organisms
> for our physical food.[29]

Sensitivity is the word to describe the social aspect of human

experience. According to Whitehead, each occasion feels previous moments

in a causal way. We are related to our own past, and to the human and

nonhuman occasions in our environment through causal feelings. The actual

occasions of the immediate past are felt in the becoming occasion.

Therefore these occasions are internal in the present moment of experience;

they are constitutive of it.

On the human level, this means that a person can feel the feelings

from his/her own past, and from other persons who make up the social

context. Sensitivity is the reception of feelings into the present

---

[29]Loomer, "Free," p. 71.

concrescence. Literally, it means feeling the feelings of others. Persons are internally related to one another because they feel the feelings of others, and because these feelings constitute the emergence of the individual.

According to Mead, sensitivity occurs through the conversation of gestures, which, on the human level becomes the mechanism for taking the attitude of the other and eventually results in the creation of the self. The human personality is social in its derivation and in its expression. Persons are created by relationships, and it is through relationships that persons express themselves. Sensitivity to others is what constitutes human experience.

Creativity: The Personal Aspect

Creativity is the word for the capacity of actual occasions to respond to others with new feelings. It is called freedom, concrescence, independence, individuality, self-determination, etc., by various writers. It is the word to describe the personal aspect of human experience.

Sensitivity shows how persons are internally related to one another, and how causal efficacy is operative in the world. Sensitivity is the social aspect of experience. If this were all that happened in the actual world, everything would be determined. The present world would be in complete conformity with the past and there would be no opportunity for creative and novel response in human experience. In order to preserve freedom and individuality, creativity must be examined. Creativity is the word to describe how the individual responds to what it has been given by

past occasions of experience in such a way that freedom is preserved and enhanced.

According to Whitehead, the actual entity has no choice about whether to be influenced by its prehensions of past actual occasions, but it does have a choice as to how it will respond. This leads to an analysis of concrescence, or the internal constitution of a single actual entity.

A brief summary of concrescence will suffice to show the basis of creativity in Whitehead. Human experience represents the most complex level of integration of prehensions into one complex feeling. The following levels show some of the options available for maximizing freedom in the becoming occasion.

1. Conceptual Valuation. At the simplest level, the becoming occasion has a measure of freedom in relation to physical feelings. That freedom is the possibility of valuing the feelings upward or downward. A feeling that is valued upward will have increasing intensity at higher levels of integration. A feeling that is valued downward will become trivial in importance.[30]

2. Conceptual Reversion. At this level, the occasion considers new forms which were not present in the physical feelings received from the past actual world. This comes by conceptual prehension of the realm of potentialities as alternatives to the forms received in the conformal phase.[31]

3. Transmutation. Transmutation is a physical feeling which feels a nexus of actual entities as if it were one actual entity, based on the form which is held in common. "Transmutation is the way in which the

_____

[30]Whitehead, Process, pp. 253-254.   [31]Ibid., p. 249.

actual world is felt as a community. . . ."[32] This increases freedom by simplifying the myriad prehensions which would immobolize the entity from creative response.

4. Propositional Feelings. The next level of complexity is reached by propositional feelings, i.e., feelings which have as their datum a proposition. A proposition is a combination of one or more actual entities as the subject with one or more eternal objects as the predicate. A proposition becomes a "lure for feeling" for novelty in the concrescing occasion.[33]

5. Intellectual Feelings. Intellectual feelings arise from "the integration of a 'propositional feeling' with the 'indicative feelings' from which it is partly derived."[34] When the connection is made between the indicated actual entities and the proposition which is a potentiality, then intellectual feelings have developed. They are the consideration of comparisons of theories and actual entities.

At this point a high level has been reached within the concrescence of the actual occasion. Each level of complexity represents not only an addition to the complexity, but another level of complexity. Each level also represents a movement away from causal efficacy as the determination of the satisfaction of the new occasion, and a movement toward the probability that novelty may be introduced into the world. Each level represents a movement away from determination and a movement toward the freedom of the subject.

---

[32]Ibid., p. 251.

[33]Ibid., pp. 185-186, 256f.

[34]Ibid., p. 266.

The concrescence of the actual entity provides the basis for creativity in the individual. Physical feelings are the way the occasion takes account of the past actual world. Through a complex process, the feelings are synthesized into a single feeling which is the actual entity and which passes onto the future. It is in the synthesizing process that the actual occasion has its freedom as the personal aspect of existence. Its freedom consists in its ability to create itself out of the data which are received, and its ability to transcend itself in its search for more creativity.

> . . . the self, in its emergence from its relationships . . . creates itself. In its emergence, it becomes its own cause. Its creativity is in the first instance its self-creativity. Its self-creativity is its process of synthesizing the objectified qualitative energies out of which it emerges. In creating itself it makes a decision about what and who it is to be. This decision is its own reason for being what it is.[35]

Each individual is free to make of itself whatever it can make out of the data which it has received. That is its freedom. The actual occasion decides how to perceive and then transmit the physical feelings from the past into the next moment of experience, and in so doing, it creates and determines itself.

Its freedom also consists in its ability to transcend itself.

> Self-transcendence is an outreach of the self for an alternative other, a movement that aims to go beyond any achieved state or given condition. It is a discontent of the self, a restlessness to move beyond present levels of satisfactions, whether they be high or low. . . . This outreach develops a momentum of its own. It becomes a passion for the "more."[36]

The actual occasion feels the lure to become more than it can even conceive as possible in order to bring about those potentialities which seem impossible. This drives the individual toward the integration of

---

[35]Loomer, "Free," p. 74.   [36]Ibid., p. 80.

greater and greater contrasts. It is in this self-transcendence that the individual has the greatest amount of freedom, but it is a freedom which has risks because of the potential for chaos.

According to Whitehead, freedom is real because of the ability of the actual entity to determine itself and even transcend itself in terms of what it has received by way of physical feelings. The individual has the potential to value physical feelings up or down, to consider new forms for the energy received, to view many actual entities as a unity, to develop propositions about the world, and to contrast these propositions with the structure of actual entities as perceived. As the individual decides how to integrate the many actual entities of the past into one complex feeling, many alternative possibilities are possible. The freedom of the actual entity comes in its decision of what to become as the expression of the many becoming one.

In Mead's social psychology, the basis of creativity is the emergence of mind.

> The evolutionary appearance of mind or intelligence takes place when the whole process of experience and behavior is brought within the experience of any one of the separate individuals implicated therein, and when the individual's adjustment to the process is modified and refined by the awareness or consciousness which he thus has of it. It is by means of reflexiveness--the turning-back of the experience of the individual upon himself--that the whole social process is thus brought into the experience of the individuals involved in it; it is by such means, which enable the individual to take the attitude of the other toward himself, that the individual is able consciously to adjust himself to that process, and to modify the resultant of that process in any given social act in terms of his adjustment to it.[37]

In this summary, Mead shows the elements in the emergence of the human mind. Through the conversation of significant gesture, the

---

[37]Mead, _Mind_, p. 134.

individual is able to take the attitude of the other, and thus develops a perspective on him/herself. When this evolves over the life cycle into a complex unity, the person has mind. Mind is the ability of the individual to take the attitudes of others toward him/herself and thus to have a sense of self-consciousness. This reflexive mechanism vastly increases the freedom of the person to adjust to the social act, and thus to affect the outcome of the social act. Intelligent response is essentially delayed action. Rather than automatically responding to the gestures of others as in stimulus/response, the intelligent person can reflect on alternative responses and choose a gesture which will potentially achieve a desired result. Mind, or the ability of a person to internalize the conversation of gesture and delay response based on value choices, is the basis of creativity. Through mind, persons have increased freedom to affect the social process as well as be affected by it. "We are continually changing our social system in some respects, and we are able to do that intelligently because we can think."[38]

The creative part of the self Mead calls the "I." The "I" is that part of the self which responds to the social act in progress. That which is received from others, their attitudes as communicated in significant gestures, and the attitudes one takes toward oneself, all make up the "me." But to the part of the self which is received in social interaction, the mind formulates a response which becomes actual. That response is always unpredictable to some extent because there are always alternative possibilities. Thus the "I" contains the potential for novelty.

---

[38]Ibid., pp. 168.

The "I" gives the sense of freedom, of initiative. The situation is there for us to act in a self-conscious fashion. We are aware of ourselves, and of what the situation is, but exactly how we will act never gets into experience until after the action takes place.[39]

Thus we have a basis for creativity in the ability of the individual to self-consciously choose alternative responses which will change the social act and the social structure. This provides a basis for the personal aspect of human existence, i.e., individuality and freedom within the context of the social dimension.

In summary, creativity is a basic characteristic of human existence. Creativity is the ability of persons to decide in each moment of experience what they will make of what they have received from the social context. Persons have no choice about receiving feelings from the past actual world, but they have choices about how they will respond to these feelings and what they will make of themselves in each moment. According to Whitehead, the internal constitution of actual occasions includes many levels of complexity which increase the potential for novelty in the world. Becoming occasions can consider many contrasts between actual entities and contrasts between entities and future possibilities. They can then decide which of these possibilities will be actualized in its own integration of the many actual entities into one complex feeling. The internal constitution of the actual entity provides the basis for creativity, the personal aspect of human experience.

According to Mead, creativity is possible because of the emergence of mind through the social process. Through the ability to internalize the conversation of significant gestures and to delay action

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 177-178.

while consideration is given to alternative behavior, the intelligent person can gain some control over the social interaction and influence its consequences.

Summary and Conclusions

The problem for this chapter arose from the analysis of the assumptions about human nature in the literature of pastoral care and counseling. Wise and Johnson are typical of the field which views persons as the primary unit of reality. Persons are driven by inherent biological, psychological, and spiritual needs to seek relationships with others and find satisfaction of these needs. The problem with this view of human nature is that it drives toward an individualization which seeks actualization of the self, but does not provide the basis for mutual relationships and the larger community. The test of the difficulaty with this anthropology comes in an examination of the doctrine of love. The bifurcation of the social and personal in human nature leads to divisions and contradictions within love.

The task of this chapter has been to describe a view of human nature in which the social and personal are aspects of the same process. The thesis of this chapter is that human experience is a process of interaction characterized by sensitivity, i.e., feeling the feelings of others, and by creativity, i.e., responding to others with new feelings.

This anthropology is based on the premise that basic reality is similar to a moment of human experience. It is a process of interaction in which each moment of experience receives its being from the past and synthesizes that process into a complex unity which it then passes on to other occasions in the future. Mead refers to this process as a

context out of which future gestures arise, and mutual adjustment by the persons creates the social act in which they are involved. Life is a process of becoming which is never static, but constantly moves from the past into the future.

Two characteristics of reality provide the basis for the discussion of human nature. One characteristic is the way in which each moment of experience is a reenactment of the past. The other characteristic is the way in which each moment of experience contains an element of originality. These two characteristics are present in the experience of every moment.

The way in which experience repeats the past provides a basis for sensitivity. The immediate past provides the context in which the present occasion occurs. According to Whitehead, occasions are internally related by physical feelings. Physical feelings are vectors of energy which flow from past actual occasions into the internal constitution of present occasions. This transition from occasion to occasion means that the becoming occasion is internally related to its past, thus providing a basis for relationality. According to Mead, persons are related through a conversation of gestures. As the person learns through the conversation of gestures to take the attitudes of others, the person develops a self which he calls the "me," the organized attitudes of others. This part of the self is a product of the social situation. Human experience is a complex synthesis of one's sensitivity to others and to the total society of which one is a part. Persons are social in their very existence, which means that persons are the product of their sensitivity to others and to the universe.

The way in which each moment of experience contains originality provides the basis for creativity. Creativity is the ability to conceive of potentialities which do not exist in actuality and to choose between these possibilities in actual behavior. Whitehead describes the aspect of existence as concrescence. Each occasion receives its existence from past occasions, but through a complex process is able to conceive of alternative forms for future existence. By conceptualizing contrasts within harmony, a person can decide how to unify what has been received. The decision about such a synthesis gives freedom for the person to have a measure of self-determination and the potential to introduce novelty into the world. Mead describes creativity as the emergence of mind, or the ability of the individual to internalize the conversation of gestures, and to self-consciously conceive of alternative responses, one of which can be actualized in a moment of interaction. The freedom to choose between alternative responses means that a person can influence the interaction and determine to some extent the outcome of the social act and the larger social structure. Every occasion of experience involves the reception of feelings from the past, and the decision about how to synthesize these feelings for the future. Thus persons are free in their very existence, which means that every moment of experience involves some level of creativity, no matter how trivial. Creativity is the personal aspect of existence in which the person is alone and solitary in his/her freedom.

The anthropology here is based on the dyadic interaction of sensitivity and creativity. "Thus the process of becoming is dipolar, (i) by reason of its qualification by the determinateness of the actual world, and (ii) by its conceptual prehensions of the indeterminateness

of eternal objects."[40] Sensitivity is the reception of the relationships from the immediate past into the becoming actual occasion. Creativity is the response of the actual occasion by choosing among alternative possibilities.

> The self is at once communal and individual in its being, at once relational (or dependent) and independent, and at once determined and free. The first terms (communal, relational, and determined) belong together, as do the second terms (individual, independent, and free).[41]

Persons receive their being from the past, and thus are social in their essential nature. Persons choose how to synthesize the feelings they receive and choose alternative responses, and thus are personal in their essential nature. Sensitivity and creativity are ways of describing the essential nature of human experience.

> Whitehead describes our experience as a series of "concretions," that is, moments of new decisions, each with its relations to the past and to the social environment, and yet each with a novel addition from within the subjectivity of the person to the way in which experience takes shape for him.[42]

In this process view of human nature, persons have direct internal relationships with one another and with the larger society, without destroying their uniqueness and freedom. In their essential nature, individuals are social and personal. Love is not required to bridge the separation between persons because they are internally related. Neither is God required to hold the world together because the world is one society in its very essence. Rather love and God are ways of speaking about the quality of the relationships within the world, which is the topic of the next chapter.

---

[40] Whitehead, _Process_, p. 45.   [41] Loomer, "Free," p. 69.

[42] Daniel Day Williams, _The Minister and the Care of Souls_ (New York: Harper, 1961), pp. 98-99.

Chapter Three

LOVE IN HUMAN EXPERIENCE

Introduction

Chapter One showed that there is a bifurcation of the social and

personal in the view of human nature which is predominant in the field of

pastoral care and counseling. This bifurcation is a problem because it

does not provide an adequate basis for relationships between persons or

for the solidarity of society. One of its consequences is a division

within the doctrine of love between self-love and love of others.

Chapter Two described a view of human nature in which the social

and personal are aspects of the same process within human existence.

Persons are created from relationships to others and in the midst of

these relationships persons have freedom to respond in unique ways.

There is no bifurcation of the social and personal because both are

aspects of the internal constitution of human experience. Love is not

needed to heal the separation between persons and make relationships

possible.

> Love does not create our essential interrelatedness. Love is an
> acknowledgment of it. We are to love because we are bound to each
> other. . . . [Love] is a quality of a person, or a quality of a
> relationship.[1]

If one works from an anthropology which has a gap of the social

and the personal, then love is necessary to bridge the gap between

persons and make relationships possible. What is impossible in terms of

---

[1]Bernard M. Loomer, "The Size of God," (mimeographed, 1978),
pp. 24-25.

anthropology is made possible by love. However, with the integration of the social and personal in the view of human nature in this study, love is free to take on a different character. The focus of this chapter is the doctrine of love. The task is to describe and define love as unified and beneficial to the self and others at the same time.

The difficulty for Wise and Johnson was that the gap between the social and personal showed up as a division within love between self-love and love of others. According to Wise and Johnson, self-love is the ability of the individual to relate to the environment in such a way as to satisfy inherent needs. The healthy individual can form relationships with others to meet his/her deepest needs in order to move to the higher levels of self-actualization. The problem with self-love is that it has a tendency to become egocentric and selfish, and to use other persons to meet one's own needs. Such selfishness undercuts the basis of mutual relationships and solidarity in society. The task for Wise and Johnson was to define a mature and enlightened self-love which is willing to sacrifice the needs of the self for the needs of others and thus provide a basis for community. Here they became entangled in contradictions. They said that self-love is the seed for the love of others, but it must grow and learn by the examples of others in the social situation. They said that self-love could function for the needs of others, but were unclear about whether this was a sacrifice of the self. They failed to define self-love as a basis for the love of others.

According to Wise and Johnson, love of others is the ability of the individual to place the needs of others equal to the needs of the self. The problem with this view of the love of others is that there is no motive power in it for the self. Love of others which requires

postponment of gratification and denial of one's own needs for the benefit

of the other leads to frustration and resentment for the self because its

own needs are not met. The task for Wise and Johnson was to define

love of others as beneficial to the self. But again they got entangled

in contradictions. They tried to say that love of others is inherent,

but then acknowledged that it had to be carefully taught and learned.

They tried to say that love of others is unconditional self-giving, but

then also wanted to say that it expected mutual responsiveness. They

failed to be convincing that the love of others would be beneficial to

the self.

It is the thesis of this study that the divisions within love

are the result of the bifurcation of the social and personal in the view

of human nature. Chapter Two presented an anthropology in which social

relationships are internal to personality and individuality is preserved

by free response. The description of love in this chapter will be a

test as to whether the integration of the social and the personal makes

a difference in the doctrine of love.

The task of this chapter is to define love as a "quality of a

person, or a quality of a relationship,"[2] such that love is beneficial

for the self and for others at the same time.

Thesis

The previous chapter identified the essential aspects of human

experience as sensitivity and creativity. However, these essential aspects

say nothing about the quality of human life. Love is a way of identifying

value in human experience.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 25.

The thesis of this chapter is the following definition:

Love in human experience is a quality of interaction characterized by sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others, and God, and by creativity which moves toward enlarged freedom for self, others, and God.

This definition builds on the definition of Chapter Two by introducing the qualities of sensitivity and creativity which characterize love in human experience. When sensitivity is maximized in experience, it moves toward communion, that is, the ability of persons to accurately feel the feelings of others and to enjoy those feelings. When creativity is maximized in experience it means an increase in freedom for all the world.

Definitions

Category of size. In this study, love is the word for value. It refers to the quality of sensitivity and creativity which moves toward "communion in freedom."[3] This paper is written within the larger context of process thought whose value theory is assumed in this paper. It is not appropriate to give a full treatment of value theory in process thought. Instead the category of size will be discussed. Loomer summarizes the category of size in the following paragraph:

> Within the conception of power as relational, size is funda-
> mentally determined by the range of intensity of internal relationships
> one can help create and sustain. The largest size is exemplified in
> those relationships whose range exhibits the greatest compatible
> contrasts, contrasts which border on chaos (Whitehead). The
> achievement of the apex of size involves sustaining a process of
> transforming incompatible contrasts or contradictions into compatible
> contrasts, and of bearing those contrasts within the integrity of
> one's individuality.[4]

---

[3] Daniel Day Williams, The Spirit and Forms of Love (New York: Harper, 1968), p. 3.

[4] Bernard M. Loomer, "Two Kinds of Power," Criterion, 15 (1976), 28.

In process thought, value is a product of harmony and intensity. Harmony refers to the unity of feelings that are integrated by an actual occasion or society. Harmony involves compatibility among feelings. Intensity refers to the depth of experience which is a product of breadth and contrast. Breadth is the term for the amount of the concrete world which is included in the integration without being trivialized. Contrast is the presence of feelings which have a history of being contradictory or mutually destructive, but which are unified through the introduction of novelty. Such contrasts produce intensity of experience, one expression of which is human self-consciousness.

The largest size for an individual or society is obtained by combining the greatest intensity which can be harmonized. In concrete terms this means the ability to include contrasting feelings within one's becoming without losing one's integrity or unity. Smallness of stature develops when persons try to include incompatible contrasts without unity, or when they minimize contrasts only for unity. The first becomes self-destruction; the second entropy. The drive for size in experience requires a careful balance of intensity and harmony, such that intensity is maximized to the border of chaos without losing all harmony.

The importance of size as a category is that the direction of the world process seems to be "to create those kinds of relationships from which more complex individuals and societies of greater stature may emerge."[5] Love is one way of referring to size in experience. Love is

---

[5]Loomer, "Size," p. 21.

the quality of sensitivity and creativity that moves toward greater size

for self, others, and God. Communion correlates with harmony, while

enlarged freedom correlates with intensity. Size will be used as a

category to refer to individuals and societies that have greater value.

Doctrine of God. The doctrine of God is obviously important to

the definition of love. Within the field of process thought there is

debate about the doctrine of God. This section will discuss a part of

that debate between Williams and Loomer, and locate the aspects of God

which are important for the definition of love in this paper.

According to Williams. "the being of God is dipolar."[6] The two

aspects of God's nature are the primordial and consequent natures.

> In his primordial nature God is the eternal, unchangeable structure
> of being, giving unity and coherence to the infinite realm of
> possibility and thus making some measure of community possible for
> each finite occasion.[7]

This part of God's nature corresponds most closely to traditional

doctrines of God as unchangeable. God contains the structure of all

possibilities in their ordered relevance for actual occasions and makes

these possibilities available for each becoming occasion. In this aspect

God is necessary for the unity of the world. By containing all relevant

possibilities for the actual world, God preserves values, since novelty

comes through the ingression of new forms into the world of process.

> In his consequent nature God is actual, temporal process. He acts
> in specific ways and places and times. His action expresses his
> subjective aim, but is also conditioned by his response to the actions

---

[6]Daniel Day Williams, "How Does God Act?" in E. Freemand and W. L. Reese (eds.) (LaSalle: Open Court, 1964), p. 171.

[7]Daniel Day Williams, "God and Time," South East Asia Journal of Theology, 2 (January 1961), 15.

of the creatures in their limited, and often destructive and tragic choices.[8]

This part of God's nature is concrete. Here God is influenced by the decisions of actual occasions, and responds in concrete ways that are consistent with God's aim toward value. This adds to the traditional doctrine of God because God is affected by what happens in the world. God suffers with the world and God's destiny is tied up with actuality.

> God is the eternal structure and power which makes a world possible and which participates in each moment of the world's becoming, for the world is nothing without him. God is conscious, personal being.[9]

God is the rational ordering of all relevant values for the world, and God is active participation in the world through adjustment and response. Williams can speak meaningfully of God as the creator because without God the unity of the world is impossible, and actual occasions could not function. In the primordial nature, God is the one who holds the world in unity as a community. Williams can also speak of God as love because God is involved in the world. To love means to suffer with and be affected by another. In the consequent nature God faithfully interacts with individuals and societies to bring about communion and freedom for the world. For Williams, God is that actual entity which works for communion and freedom in the world.

Loomer says that the question of God is identical with the question of the unity of the world. For Loomer, God is the world process, and its unity can only be determined by reference to empirical evidence. He finds such evidence in the "interconnectedness of events and the qualities experienced in profound religious intuitions."[10]

---

[8]Ibid.   [9]Williams, Spirit, p. 125.   [10]Loomer, "Size," p. 39.

Based on this evidence, Loomer concludes that the concrete world is a unity. The world seems to be a "generalized enduring society,"[11] which he then identifies as God. He says there is no evidence that the world is "a society with a personal order."[12] Rather, ". . . God as a wholeness is to be identified with the concrete interconnected totality of this struggling, imperfect, unfinished, and evolving web."[13] The world is a unity and its unity can be called God.

God as the unity of the world has directionality. Loomer sees evidence that the world process (God) shows an "organic restlessness"[14] toward an increase in value, although it can also become the passion for evil. God tends to move to "create those kinds of relationships from which more complex individuals and societies of greater stature may emerge."[15] In Whiteheadian terms, this is the increase in value.

Since the full development of a doctrine of God is beyond the scope of this paper, a summary of the positions of Williams and Loomer have been given. Williams describes a dipolar God who is the structure of all possibilities for the world and who is concretely involved as an interactant with all individuals. Loomer describes a God who he identifies with the world process with an ambiguous directionality toward greater value. Both of these scholars have a contribution to make to this paper, and the following aspects of God are true for both of them.

First, God is concrete. God is concrete in the society of the world. As such, God is a physical cause in the world, and God is physically

---

[11]Ibid., p. 41.   [12]Ibid., p. 42.   [13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid.   [15]Ibid., p. 21.

affected by the free decisions of actual entities. Sensitivity to God is more than having novel ideas which can shape the process of becoming. It includes physical feelings of God. This is what Williams means by the consequent nature of God, that God receives and responds to the world in concrete ways. Loomer speaks to the same thing in pointing to God as concrete process with directionality toward the increase of value. Creativity which enlarges freedom for God is the physical effect of the decisions of actual entities. Williams say that God's consequent nature receives the world physically and adjusts to it. Loomer implies that individual creativity shapes God's very existence. God is concrete.

Second, God is the one who symbolizes the unity of the world. The world is an interconnected society of all occasions, and God is a member of this society who has the perspective of the whole. In traditional theology, God is the one who loves the whole world and works for its salvation. For Williams, God is "that reality which is involved in the structure and becoming of everything that is, and that which is necessary to give coherence, relatedness, and an ultimate valuation to each occasion of experience."[16] God is the one who is responsible for the unity of the world. For Loomer, God is the totality of the world and his word for that totality. For both Williams and Loomer, speaking of God is a way of speaking about the unity of the world. Love is a kind of sensitivity and creativity which moves toward the communion and freedom of all that is actual. No action can be judged as loving apart from its effect on the total society that makes up the world, including God as the symbol of this unity.

---

[16] Daniel Day Williams, "A Philosophical Outlook, " in John E. Smith (ed.), American Philosophy (London: Allen and Unwin, 1970), p. 238.

Third, God moves toward the increase of value in the world. God

is love, that is, God moves toward the communion of all actual entities

into one harmonious society with maximum contrasts and complexity. Like-

wise God moves toward enlarged freedom for all actual entities and for

the total world. Williams says that God is consistent in the move

toward greater value.

> If God is love and the ground of the structure of love, then he
> remains in the absolute integrity of his being what he is throughout
> all time and all circumstance. His love is what ours never is,
> steadfast, adequate to his purpose, complete in concern for all
> others.[17]

Loomer describes God in terms of a general directionality toward greater

good, although with ambiguity.

> In this web of interrelatedness there are aims and purposes almost
> beyond measure. Some are compatible, some are cooperative, and others
> are mutually enhancing. Others are contraries, and still others are
> mutually contradictory and destructive. And in and through and
> because of, and in spite of this diversity and these contradictions
> and this disorder, there persists a restlessness or a tropism not
> only to live, but to live well and to live better (Whitehead). This
> passion carries its own appeal, its own authority and warrant, and
> its own limited strength to fulfill itself in due season.[18]

For the doctrine of God in this paper God is love, and Williams and

Loomer both affirm this in their own way.

Without developing a full doctrine of God that attempts to resolve

the complex issues, three conclusions have been drawn about God: 1) God

is concrete; 2) God refers to the unity of the world; 3) God has

directionality toward the increase of value, i.e., love.

Loving Sensitivity

The problem for this chapter is exploring the doctrine of love in

_____

[17]Williams, Spirit, p. 125.   [18]Loomer, "Size," p. 45.

the light of the process view of human nature which is social and personal. Love is defined as a quality of interaction which is beneficial for the self, others, and God. It is time to look more carefully at the first part of this definition of love. In the social dimension of human life, love is the quality of sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others, and God.

Sensitivity is a description of essential human nature. Human experience is constituted by its relationships to the immediate past. Thus persons are social by essential nature. Loving sensitivity is communion, which is to say, the quality of human experience is enhanced when sensitivity is valued up rather than down by the actual occasion. Loving sensitivity is a way of receiving the feelings of the immediate past and valuing up the aspect of communion or the interconnectedness of actual occasions. Loving sensitivity means opening oneself up to the social dimension of experience. Communion is another way of saying increased sensitivity, which is the movement toward larger and more complex societies of actual occasions. The eventual goal of increased sensitivity is the unity and harmony of the total world into one cooperative society which functions for the benefit of each actual occasion.

> Ultimately and fundamentally societies develop in complexity of organization only by means of the progressive achievement of greater and greater degrees of functional, behavioristic differentiation among the individuals who constitute them; . . .
> The human social ideal--the ideal or ultimate goal of human social progress--is the attainment of a universal human society in which all human individuals would possess a perfected social intelligence, such that all social meanings would each be similarly reflected in their respective individual consciousnesses. . . .[19]

Here Mead is describing the goal of communion--when every person is so

---

[19] George Herbert Mead, _Mind, Self, and Society_ (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 310.

sensitive to others that, even amidst the diversity of functions and behaviors, there is a correlation between social meanings in the attitudes of each individual. This would be a situation in which sensitivity would be maximized without violating the creativity of the individual.

For Loomer, communion is the move toward "more complex individuals and societies of greater stature."[20] The eventual goal of sensitivity is one incredibly complex society in which interconnectedness and inter-dependency is apparent within the experience of each individual. For Williams, "Communion is another word for love."[21]

Sensitivity is the word for the social dimension of life, that is, life constituted out of relationships. The goal of loving sensitivity is communion, or the unity and harmony of all actuality into one cooperative society of great stature. Loving sensitivity is a quality of interaction which moves toward communion with self, others, and God.

Communion with self. Since the self is social in its very make-up, loving sensitivity moves toward communion with the self. Others are constituent factors in the self, therefore, there can be no total division between self-love and love of others. Self-love includes love of others since others are physically present in the self. Love of others includes self-love since the self is physically present in others. This does not resolve all tension between self-love and love of others. It is possible to value down the relational aspects of experience and thus pervert love in its drive toward communion. However the gap which separates self-love and love of others in traditional views of human nature has been essentially overcome.

---

[20]Loomer, "Size," p. 21. [21]Williams, Spirit, p. 130.

Love of self is a complex phenomenon because the self is complex. All experience is social and personal through the two aspects of sensitivity and creativity. Sensitivity is the ability to feel the feelings of others through prehensions. Creativity is the freedom of the self to consider alternative responses and to respond with new feelings. Receiving and responding to feelings are the essential aspects of experience. Developing communion with the self is the ability to increase awareness of the concrete physical feelings of others in one's existence. This means paying attention to and developing awareness of the relational aspects of experience. Loving sensitivity moves toward deepened awareness of the concrete nature of the self: ". . . knowledge is derived from and confirmed by physical experience."[22]

> Physical feelings are the fundamental avenues through which we meet and absorb the elemental forces of our existence. They are the primary mode in which we experience the processive and relational as well as the qualitative (especially the affectional and evaluative) and efficacious undertows of existence and the transformative energies of creative interchange are known first of all through our bodily feelings.[23]

The importance of this emphasis on physical feelings is that sense experience and conceptual experience is clear and distinct, but less relational. There is a normal tendency in the direction away from physical experience, even though it is a source of life. The life of love values up the processive and relational aspects of the self which originate in physical experience. To the extent that sensitivity is loving, one will be aware of communion with others through physical feelings.

Communion with others. Loving sensitivity is commitment to significant interaction with others. In this context, commitment means

------

[22]Loomer, "Size," p. 6.   [23]Ibid.

the decision to freely let others into one's becoming as causal factors. Any two persons who have contact become causal factors for each other. But love means the decision in any moment of experience to invite a specific other to become a causal factor in one's experience. It is the decision to pay particular attention to the historic route of occasions we know as a person, to receive the feelings of the other, and to value those feelings upward. Loving sensitivity is the decision to feel the feelings of the other in a special way so those feelings have influence in one's life and future. Williams described this aspect of love in terms of suffering.

> Suffering in its widest sense means the capacity to be acted upon, to be changed, moved, transformed by the action of or in relation to another. The active side of love requires that we allow the field of our action and its meaning to be defined by what the other requires. To be completed in and by another is to be acted upon by that other.[24]

Loving sensitivity is the decision to suffer with another. Such suffering moves toward communion between persons as they are able to feel one another's feelings, in effect, to feel the same things, to have the same attitudes and meanings during the interaction.

The term significant interaction is derived from Mead's description of the conversation of significant gestures. Significant gestures are elements of a social act which call out the same attitudes in all the participants. The first significant interaction by an infant is with the primary caretaker with whom a special language develops. As the child matures, the number of persons with whom significant interaction is possible increases to include family members, other relatives, peers, and then members of common reference groups. The number of persons with

---

[24]Williams, Spirit, p. 117.

whom loving sensitivity is possible increases until it theoretically includes all persons in the world. In Meadian terms, loving sensitivity is the commitment to a conversation of gestures with specific others with whom one is in contact. The decision to engage in a conversation of gestures with a person in a way that is constitutive of one's own self is an example of loving sensitivity. Thus love is possible between any persons who decide to open themselves to one another and take common attitudes toward one another.

Loving sensitivity is a quality of interaction between persons. It is possible for persons to interact in such a way that they trivialize the feelings of the other and respond in ways that value down the feelings of the other. Loving sensitivity is the commitment to significant interaction with others. It is based on the decision to allow the feelings of the other to become constitutive of one's becoming.

In pastoral counseling, Wise and Johnson tried to describe a form of self-love which moved toward the love of others, and a form of love of others which was beneficial to the self. They ran into difficulties because of the gap between self and others. There are some clues at this point about how self-love and love of others are related. Self-love is communion with the physical feelings of others in the immediate past. This means sensitivity toward the occasions in one's own historic route of occasions and sensitivity toward the occasions of others. Love of others means the decision to allow the feelings of the others to become constitutive of one's own becoming and to value up the feelings from a specific other. Since the self is made up of social relationships with others, communion with the self and others tends to become the same thing. When one is sensitive to one's own physical

feelings, these include awareness of the other as constitutive of one's becoming. When one is sensitive to the other, this includes awareness of the other as physical feelings that make up one's own being. Thus self-love and love of others tend to be synonymous. The decision to value down the feelings of the other is also the decision to value down the physical feelings that make up the self, and vice versa. Loving sensitivity moves toward communion with the self and the other at the same time. The decision against love is a betrayal of the self and the other at the same time. These are hints of the unity of love and the congruence of self-love and love of others.

A special case of loving sensitivity which moves toward communion with others is the ability to form and sustain covenants with persons and groups. Loving sensitivity is the ability to sustain long-term relationships which create deeper meanings because of the history and intensity of the relationships. Loomer says that "relational power is the capacity to sustain an internal relationship."[25] By this he means "the persistent effort to create and maintain the relationship as internal."[26] This is a good description of the word covenant in the Bible. The covenant between God and Israel was an internal relationship which was formed and sustained over many generations and through the heights and depths of faithfulness and unfaithfulness. Covenant refers to internal relationships which involve persons and/or groups over long periods of time. Such covenants can be characterized by intensity and breadth.

----

[25]Loomer, "Two," p. 27.   [26]Ibid.

In a certain sense, all human existence occurs within covenants,
if covenants are understood as relationships with significant others.
Mead's description of the genesis of the self shows the evolution of
relationships from the individual and the primary caretaker, to the primary
group (usually family), and then to reference groups. The full development
of the self involves organizing the attitudes of others and groups into
a "generalized other" which then forms the basis for a stable sense of
self. However, the self continues to be sustained by relationships.

> Selves can only exist in definite relationship to other selves. No
> hard-and-fast line can be drawn between our own selves and the selves
> of others, since our own selves exist and enter as such into our
> experience only in so far as the selves of others exist and enter into
> our experience also. The individual possesses a self only in relation
> to the selves of the other members of his social group; and the
> structure of his self expresses or reflects the general pattern of his
> social group to which he belongs, just as does the structure of the
> self of every other individual belonging to this social group.[27]

Here Mead implies that every person lives within the context of covenant,
that is, relationships with individuals and reference groups that form the
self over time. The point here is that one of the tests of love is the
ability to sustain such covenants over the long term which can lead to
intensity and breadth of experience.

Intensity is the ability to maintain an internal relationship that
involves great contrast. Intensity is the ability to turn incompatibilities
into contrasts while maintaining the relationship. As persons repeatedly
decide to move toward one another and sustain an ongoing relationship,
they learn how to receive each other's feelings. The gestures of one
person are received by the other many times until these gestures have
clearly established meanings in the relationship. Many gestures are

---

[27]Mead, _Mind_, p. 164.

exchanged in a long history, and their special meanings within the relationship are learned by trial and error. Over a long period of time, more and more experience can be shared and the meanings of significant gestures deepen. To the extent that such long-term relationships move toward intensity and breadth while maintaining a sense of harmony in the relationship, to that extent the relationship is loving and has potential for great stature.

Communion with God. Three aspects of God have been identified: a) God as concrete; b) God as the drive toward the unity of the world; c) God as the drive toward the increase in value. Every occasion is related to God. Love is the word which speaks of the quality of the relationship between actual occasions and God. To the extent that love characterizes this relationship it is communion with God.

Loving sensitivity moves toward communion with God. This means an openness to feel the feelings of God, an openness which values up the feelings of God and allows them to be constitutive of one's own becoming. But the feelings of God are different than the feelings of other actual entities. How can one be sensitive to God, to allow God to have increasing causal efficacy in one's becoming?

Since God is concrete, communion with God is sensitivity to the concreteness of the world. Loomer calls this sensitivity to the concrete an "attachment to life."

> [It is] a persistent and spirit-testing commitment to the specific
> processes of life as a "discerning immersion in what is most
> deeply present at hand and concretely at work in our midst." . . .
> The value that is at stake in a commitment of attachments is the
> value of the relational life in its deepest meaning. This meaning
> (for us) is symbolized by the cross. The discipline of this way of

life invovles the most mature sensitivity to the workings of concrete processes in the context of internal relations.[28]

Williams' emphasis on the consequent nature of God also points toward this emphasis on the concreteness of life.

. . . his concrete nature is his participation with his creatures. in the society of being. . . . God's actuality involves concrete process. God shares with the creatures the power of his being, allowing them a measure of freedom and spontaneity so that God's temporal interaction with his creatures is a real history of inter-communication and action. What happens in the world makes a difference to God. He responds concretely to every new event by taking it as a datum into a new phase of his own life and adjusting it within the harmony of his vision.[29]

While Loomer and Williams have a different emphasis in the doctrine of God, they agree that God is involved in the concrete processes of life. God is affected by every concrete decision that is made in the world and God responds to all decisions in the concrete nature. Thus sensitivity to God is sensitivity to concrete process.

Within the concrete process, God is felt in two ways: as the drive toward the unity of the world and as the drive toward the increase of value. Sensitivity to one's own concrete experience leads to awareness of the many prehensions which are synthesized into a unity. The self is the many becoming one. The many physical feelings of the past are unified and synthesized into a single physical feeling for the future. Thus sensitivity to one's own process leads to an experience of the unity of the world. Each actual occasion is a focus of the many of the world and reveals the interconnectedness and interdependency of the world.

Loving sensitivity gains awareness of the unity of the world also through others. Loving sensitivity is that awareness of relationality that moves beyond the specific other toward the unity of all occasions. The

---

[28]Loomer, "Size," p. 17.   [29]Williams, _Spirit_, pp. 108-109.

other is a unity of the world, a many becoming one. When one is fully

sensitive to the fullness of the feelings received from the other, one

becomes aware of the connectedness of the other with occasions beyond

itself. The other is connected to others, and the feelings received from

the other are the synthesis of what the other has made of those feelings.

Such awareness of how the self and the other are related to the

world leads to an awareness of the unity of the world. Sensitivity to the

unity of the world in concrete actuality is sensitivity to God.

> Nothing has its being solely in itself. To love another is to see
> that person as he is, in all the dimensions of his life, and in all
> that makes him a person. It is to love the bond which makes us one
> with him, that is to love God. . . . If Christianity is true, there
> is no such thing as loving another only for himself, for every person
> is a participant in the society of being. He bears the image of
> God and he is loved as one who belongs in communion with God and
> his fellows.[30]

The other is one who integrates the many of the actual world. Love is

awareness of this one and many character of the self and the other. Love

involves the respect for the unity of the actual world as it is reflected

in concrete process. Such love is sensitivity to God.

Within the concrete process God is also felt as the drive for the

increase of value. Williams speaks of God's action in providing the

"initial aim" for every occasion. The initial aim is God's intervention

in every occasion to bring the increase in value.[31] Williams also

identifies God's consequent nature as action which is "concretely

apprehended in feeling in such a way that God's specific response to the

world becomes a constituent function in the world."[32] For Loomer, God is

---

[30]Ibid., p. 140.   [31]Williams, "How," p. 174.

[32]Ibid., p. 179.

experienced as "the organic restlessness of the whole body of creation" which generally moves toward the increase of value.[33]

Sensitivity to God means sensitivity to this lure or restlessness within concrete process toward greater value. Love means moving toward communion with this drive for value and making decisions which are congruent with it. Loving God means allowing the physical drive for value to become constitutive of one's becoming. Sensitivity to God is the best guide for the decisions of the actual occasion since God is the largest perspective on the world and the perspective with the greatest stature. To the extent that individuals are sensitive to God, their stature is increased, because their perspective is enlarged and the potential for greater intensity and breadth of experience is maximized.

Summary. Sensitivity is the social dimension of human experience. Love is the quality of sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others, and God. Developing communion with the self is the ability to increase awareness of the concrete physical feelings of others in one's existence. Developing communion with others is commitment to significant covenant relationships with other persons and groups. Developing communion with God involves sensitivity to the concrete process which is felt as the drive toward the unity of the world and the drive toward the increase of value.

Since persons are internally related to one another through sensitivity, the function of love is not to overcome the separation between them. Rather, love refers to the quality of interaction which

---

[33]Loomer, "Size," p. 42.

occurs between persons. Since the social aspect of experience is an

essential part of human nature, love is not divided in the same way. There

is still a distinction of self and other, but in the process anthropology,

self and other are not separate. The self is an emergent from the

relationships to the past actual world, and the other is created by the

same process. The self is internal to the other, and the other is internal

to the self. Thus self-love and love of others tend to be synonymous.

Love which moves toward communion with the self is awareness of the physical

feelings of others, that is, the presence of others in the constitution

of the self. Self-love is communion with others as they have become a

part of the self. Likewise, love of others is communion with others as

they are expressed in physical feelings which is also awareness of the

self. Communion with one's concreteness also leads to communion with God

since God is present in the concreteness of experience, and is felt as

the drive toward the unity of the world and the drive toward the increase

of value. As one allows the physical feelings of the self and others to

be constitutive of the self, i.e., to value up these feleings, one also

gains communion with God who is concrete in the same process.

Loving Creativity

The task in this chapter is to examine the doctrine of love in the

light of a process anthropology which is social and personal. This section

will examine the second part of the definition of love, the personal

dimension. Love is the quality of creativity which moves toward enlarged

freedom for self, others, and God. Creativity is a description of

essential human nature. Human experience is characterized by freedom to

choose between alternative responses in each moment. This is the personal

dimension of human experience. Loving creativity is enlarged freedom, the response of new feelings which enlarge the potential response for the future. Enlarged freedom is another way of saying increased creativity, the movement toward greater size for actual occasions and the totality of the world. The eventual goal of increased creativity is maximum intensity for the world.

> The creative advance is to be seen as a movement toward greater stature in which the zest for novel ideas of larger generality plays its needed role. This advance involves the transformation of incompatibilities and contradictions into compatible contrasts within the unity of the web and within the lives of its members.[34]

Loomer is describing the goal of enlarged freedom--when the total society can obtain maximal size to synthesize the contrasting feelings of the world and so create intensity within the unity of the world. Enlarged freedom is the mechanism whereby such intensity is a potential for individuals and the world.

Creativity is the word for the personal dimension of life, that is, life as freedom of response to the relationships from which it emerges. The goal of loving creativity is enlarged freedom, or the greatest size which can synthesize maximal contrasts for the sake of intensity of experience. Loving creativity is a quality of interaction which moves toward enlarged freedom for self, others, and God.

Enlarged freedom for the self. Many descriptions of love speak of self-denial and concern for the other without regard for the self. But this description of love as creativity begins with how love is related to the self. The self is defined as social and made up of internal relations

---

[34]Ibid., p. 64.

with others, and loving sensitivity means valuing up the social aspect of experience. Thus self-love and love of others are close. In terms of creativity, the situation is more complex. There is some tendency within creativity to move toward the solitariness of the self. This tendency is the temptation to sin which will be discussed later. The check on the tendency to move toward solitariness is that freedom is momentary and the decision, once made, is efficacious for other occasions. The self is created by the many relationships coming to a focus in the one occasion, being synthesized into a complex feeling which then becomes a datum for the future. Creativity comes in the consideration of alternative responses and the decision of which possibility to actualize for the future. Since human experience is social through and through, it is difficult to enlarge freedom for oneself without also enlarging freedom for others and for God. Likewise it is difficult to enlarge freedom for others without also enlarging freedom for the self. The interdependence of the social and personal dimensions lead to a new perspective on love.

The possibility of enlarged freedom for the self arises, first, out of its self-creativity. According to the process anthropology, there is no self which then makes decisions about its relationships. Rather, the self is its decisions about relationships. "Freedom refers to the self's decision. The self is its decision. The self as its decision is what it makes out of what it has been given to work with."[35] First there are prehensions, then there is the decision which integrates these prehensions into an objectified unity which is the self. The freedom of

_____

[35]Bernard M. Loomer, "Dimensions of Freedom," in Bernard Lee and Harry J. Cargas (eds.) Religious Experience and Process Theology (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), p. 325.

the self is not a lack of causes, but is its decision about how to integrate these causes into a unity of feeling. To the extent that the decision arises out of various possibilities, to that extent the self is free. The freedom of self-creativity is the choice to take responsibility for its decision. A person who takes responsibility for self-creativity has enlarged his/her freedom. The person who denies responsibility for self-creativity is choosing to be caused totally by the relationships from the past, and is minimizing the alternatives available for decision. In contrast, the person who takes responsibility for self-creativity opens him/herself to the consideration of alternative decisions. In Meadian terms the person with minimal freedom responds automatically to the gestures of others without using the mind's ability to delay action and choose from the alternatives made possible by the internalization of the conversation of gestures. The individual's possibility of self-creation comes because the social act can be rehearsed inside the mind and the awareness of alternatives increased. A person willing to accept responsibility for decisions increases the likelihood that a particular response will be made which will enlarge the freedom of the self and the other.

The possibility of enlarged freedom for the self arises, second, out of the possibility of self-transcendence.

> The point is that no preestablished limits can be set which exhaust the restless passion of the spirit. The spirit can transcend in fact or in imagination any socially determined boundaries which purport to define the range of possibility toward the more, the beyond.[36]

The freedom of the self transcends its ability to be self-creative. The self has a general restlessness toward a size of which even the self

---

[36]Bernard M. Loomer, "The Free and Relational Self," in W. W. and Gibson Winter (eds.) Belief and Ethics (Chicago: Center for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1978), p. 71.

is not aware. It is the drive to integrate contrasts that appear absolutely contradictory and to risk destruction of the self in the process. In spite of the risk, self-transcendence does enlarge the possibilities of freedom. The self is pulled toward the more which transcends the drive for the security and protection of the self. There is a general drive toward novelty, toward larger experiences which integrate more relationships and make greater intensity and breadth in individuals and societies.

Love for the self moves toward enlarged freedom for the self. This means increasing the potential responses to the world, and enlarging the size of the self so that it can take in more of the world with greater novelty. Larger size for the self involves greater intensity of experience within harmony. Because of the interdependence of the self with its world, greater size for the self increases freedom for others and for God.

Enlarged freedom for others. Creativity is the response of the actual occasion which has causal efficacy for the immediate future of other occasions and the world. Love is creativity which moves toward enlarged freedom for others. Thus creativity is a form of power in relation to others. Creativity is the response to others which influences their becoming. Love is a quality of power. Loomer discusses the quality of power in human experience by the distinction between unilateral and relational power.

> . . . unilateral power is the ability to produce intended or desired
> effects in our relationships to nature and other people. More
> specifically, unilateral power is the capacity to influence, guide,
> adjust, manipulate, shape, control, or transform the human or natural
> environment in order to advance one's own purposes.[37]

---

[37]Loomer, "Two," p. 14.

The clue to the definition of unilateral power is the last phrase, which denies the relational nature of human life. Unilateral power is the attempt to influence another for selfish gain. In contrast, relational power assumes that the self and others are internally related so that what affects one affects the other. "The ultimate aim of relational power is the creation and enhancement of those relationships in which all participating members are transformed into individuals and groups of greater stature."[38] Relational power is based on causal efficacy and internal relationships between persons. Such an anthropology leads to a definition of love as action which is beneficial both to the self and the other. Loomer describes the two aspects of loving creativity which lead to enlarged freedom for others.

> On the one hand, in exercising an influence within the relationship one makes his claims and expresses his concerns in such a style as to enable the other to make his largest contribution to the relationship. With this contribution the experiences of all the participants are intensified and broadened. In making one's claims and in exercising one's influence on the other in this fashion, the freedom of the other is recognized and respected. On the other hand, one is to receive the presence and influence of the other within the relationship in such a manner that the other is enabled to enter more freely and fully into the relationship. In being received in this fashion the one who influences may be more open to absorb the influences of others.[39]

The two aspects of loving creativity in relation to the other are:

a) responses which enlarge the freedom and stature of the other, and

b) responses which show sensitivity to the other. These will be treated in reverse order.

First, loving creativity is a response which shows sensitivity to the other. How one responds in a moment to the feelings received from the other will determine whether the other can perceive that his/her

---

[38]Ibid., p. 26   [39]Ibid.

feelings were received in the same way they were sent. A loving response is one which shows that the other's feelings were taken into account in one's becoming and made a constituent part of the response. "In love we give of our personal being and uniqueness. But we do not love unless our personal being is transformed through the relation to the other."[40] Loving sensitivity is suffering or the openness to allow the other to become an important constituent of one's being. Here the emphasis is on the response which reveals such sensitivity, i.e., that the feelings of the other were valued up in one's own experience. In Meadian terms, interaction is loving when the conversation of gestures is able to complete itself in common attitudes in all the participants at a relatively intense level. Such creativity enlarges the freedom of all participants by deepening the relationality and making deeper meanings possible. In practical terms, knowing that one's feelings have been accurately received increases one's freedom to let those feelings go and move on to other feelings, or to move more deeply into those feelings so they can be worked through. Thus a part of loving creativity is responsiveness to the other which shows that the feelings and gestures of the other have been received into one's becoming.

Second, loving creativity to others is a response which enlarges the freedom and size of the other. How one responds to the other provides part of the data which contitute the other. Loving creativity is a response which gives the other the chance to enlarge the options in his/her synthesis. The other is not responsible for what he/she received, but is responsible for what he/she makes out of the data received. Loving

_____

[40]Williams, Spirit, p. 117.

creativity is a response which increases the potential ways in which the other may synthesize the data into a new decision.

The question of how to enlarge the freedom of the other is a concrete question. In one situation it may be a response which gives the other wide latitude to respond in various ways, and the freedom of the other consists in the number of options available for response. In another situation it may be a response which limits the options at one level in order to move the relationship to another level where the options are much broader. In either case the goal is enlarged freedom for the other.

In terms of the initial task to define love which is beneficial to self and others at the same time, there are clues here on how they come together. Because of the internal relationship between self and other, enlarged freedom for self and other tend to be synonymous. When one enlarges one's own freedom, it makes possible the inclusion of more of the other into one's being, and increases the possible responses of the other. When one acts to enlarge the freedom of the other, the other is increased in size so that more of the world can be taken into account and the potential for intensity increases. This has a direct effect on the self and increases its size as well. Because of the internal relations of actual occasions and the interdependence of the whole world, any enlargement of freedom and size has its effect at every level from the self, to the other, to God.

Covenant relationships provide a special opportunity for the maximizing of loving creativity between self and others. Sustaining an internal relationship over the long term makes possible a significant level of communion between persons. By sharing feelings and gestures over many years, persons come to know, understand, and feel with each other very

deeply. It may lead to deep levels of communion. Such relationships also
have the potential for maximizing freedom in the relationship as well.
Persons who can maintain a pattern of creative responses to one another
over a period of years will enlarge the freedom of each one. This can
lead to greater size for themselves and the world. Such growth in size
is not inevitable in long-term covenant relationships because persons can
also get stuck in a pattern which is not growth-producing. But the
potential for mutual growth in size is present.

Enlarged Freedom for God. The actual occasion has no choice but to
influence God. Every decision made by every actual occasion influences
the size of God. Loving creativity is the decision by actual occasions
which enlarges the freedom of God. Williams describes God's openness to
influence from the world in terms of suffering.

> . . . I affirm that God does suffer as he participates in the ongoing
> life of the society of being. . . . I am affirming the doctrine of the
> divine sensitivity. Without it I can make no sense of the being of
> God. Sensitive participation in this world means suffering, or else
> our human experience is irrelevant to anything we can say about God.[41]

Here Williams affirms God in the consequent nature, receiving physically
from the world and allowing such feelings to be constitutive of God's being.
By saying God is love, Williams says that God is open and vulnerable to
being influenced by the world. Thus the creativity of the actual occasion
has causal efficacy on the very being of God. Love is the creativity which
enlarges the size of God. How can persons act to enlarge the freedom of
God? How can decisions be made which will be loving in terms of enlarging
the freedom of God?

-----

[41]Daniel Day Williams, "Suffering and Being in Empirical Theology,"
in Bernard E. Meland (ed.) The Future of Empirical Theology (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 191-192.

First, enlarging freedom for God comes in the concreteness of the world. Since God is concrete and directly influenced by concrete occasions, loving creativity is expressed concretely. Decisions which enlarge the freedom and size of the self and others also enlarge the freedom of God. The size of God is increased as the size of individuals and societies in the world increase. To the extent that the world includes greater size, to that extent God's size is enlarged.

Enlarging the freedom of God is expressed in the greater unity of the world. The world is a factual unity of interconnected occasions, but it is not a compatible unity. The world is divided against itself and includes mutually contradictory and destructive individuals and societies that undermine the unity of the world. To the extent that the world is not unified and harmonious, it is of lesser size. Unity comes through the conversion of incompatibilities into contrasts. This leads to intensity and beauty. Any decision which moves toward the unity of the world enlarges the freedom of God.

Loving creativity also enlarges the freedom of God by aiming at the increase of value. ". . . at the heart of things there is a passion or a restlessness to move toward the increase in value, to achieve the more, to transform what is into a better."[42] To the extent that a decision of an actual occasion moves toward this increase in value it enlarges the freedom of God.

Summary. Creativity is the personal dimension of human experience. It is the freedom of the person to consider alternative possibilities and

---

[42]Loomer, "Size," p. 21.

to decide how to respond in the midst of social relationships. Loving creativity is a quality of interaction which moves toward enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. Enlarged freedom for self comes as it takes responsibility for its self-creativity and its potential for self-transcendence. Enlarged freedom for others comes when one responds with gestures which show sensitivity and function to enlarge the potential responses of the other. Enlarged freedom for God comes when one acts to enlarge the occasions which make up the concreteness of the world. Such action leads to greater unity in the world and to greater value.

One of the myths about love is that it is the opposite of freedom, that it involves the enslavement of the self to the needs of the other. This myth arises from the division between self-love and love of others. If the love of others means self-sacrifice for the needs of the other, then love does involve the loss of freedom for the self. This is a distorted understanding of love. The view of human nature as social and personal leads to a different understanding of love. Since persons are internally related, decisions which have their effect on the self also affect the other, and vice versa. Thus it is meaningful to speak about freedom for the self and the other as love.

Ambiguity and Sin

This paper has described the essential characteristics of human experience and the essential aspects of love. Human experience is social and personal and is characterized by sensitivity and creativity. Love is characterized by movement toward communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. However, as modern existentialists have pointed out, human life does not function only in its essential characteristics. In

the concreteness of life the essential nature is experienced as ambiguous and perverted by the human will. It is not within the purpose of this paper to give a full treatment of the existential predicament, but some of the issues need to be discussed.

According to Loomer, life has an internal ambiguity. By ambiguity he means to refer to the divisions within life itself. There does not seem to be a single purpose toward the good in the concreteness of life. Rather, "the world of our experience is at odds with itself."[43] This arises out of his observation "that our world, especially at the human level, is filled with evil and ambiguous elements which thwart and bedevil the noblest purposes of God and man."[44]

First, ambiguity arises through ambivalence in individuals and societies. Individuals are created as physical feelings are integrated into a single complex physical feeling. Enduring individuals are a series of such occasions of experience, and societies are collections of individuals with "a common mode of behavior or feeling."[45] Individuals and societies are emergents from the claims of many relationships. In the integration of these relationships, a single decision is the result, but "it need not be singleminded."[46] Within the decision there will be ambivalence, i.e., the presence of two or more conflicting feelings at once. There is no escape from these claims because of the essential social nature of experience, and it leads to ambiguity in human life. It is difficult for an individual or society to be unambiguously for the good because of the deep ambivalence in every occasion of experience.

---

[43]Ibid., p. 48.   [44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid., p. 14.   [46]Ibid., p. 51.

Second, ambiguity arises through the tension of the social and personal aspects of human existence. The individual is an emergent from its relationships with its drive toward creative freedom. In some ways, freedom is encouraged by the relationality of existence because it is part of the restlessness toward greater size. But freedom has an untamed and wild side which threatens to expand beyond its relationships and create instability. At the same time the relationality of life puts limits on freedom and threatens its existence by demanding that it be definite and concrete. So there are contrasting drives, one toward expansion, the other toward containment.

> On the one hand there is a restlessness to continue the advance to a more complex stage even though this effort requires a finer and more demanding discipline. On the other side there is an impulse to rest and be content with the good which has been achieved.[47]

The impulse of freedom pushes toward the more with the threat of instability, while the impulse of relationality pulls toward stability with the threat of developing a closed system. Every advance endangers the stability, and every satisfaction endangers the advance. The result, according to Loomer, is that "in many instances the higher levels of achievement become increasingly fragile in their constitution."[48] Greater size demands an openness to new possibilities which makes it vulnerable to demands which would destroy it. Thus freedom and relationality have an inherent conflict which creates ambiguity in life.

Third, ambiguity as the mixture of good and evil is "found at the core of the human spirit."[49] Human life has simultaneous drives toward realizing new potentials and living the full life, but also fearing the

---

[47]Ibid., p. 53.   [48]Ibid., p. 54.   [49]Ibid., p. 55.

success of greater size and withdrawing from life in self-defense. On another level, one can see that good and evil in a person are actually the same thing. The strengths of a person that can lead to greater size are also the weaknesses that create a dangerous pride and selfishness. Depth psychology has clearly shown that the life force of a person often correlates with the shadow side of personality, and one must be able to face both the good and evil in oneself in order to make use of one's potential. This ambiguity cannot be eliminated without also destroying the very impulses of life.

Loomer has identified ambiguity in the concreteness of human life. In its existential form, life is ambivalent, at odds with itself, and a mixture of good and evil to its core. While we can abstract the essential characteristics of life through a rational philosophy, life in its concreteness has ambiguity which is inherent. Much human trouble can be traced to this ambiguity and the confusion it creates as individuals and societies make decisions which try to move toward "qualitative richness."[50]

Sin is the word for describing "the wilful violation of [the] essential and created goodness."[51] Williams is helpful in identifying that perversion of life which willfully arises in the human spirit. His definition of sin is "life turning away from life in communion."[52] He refers to the biblical description of sin as a primordial communion of God and the world which is denied and disrupted by human decision with the consequence of broken community.[53] As such, sin is a perversion of love,

---

[50]Ibid., p. 46.

[51]Williams, Spirit, p. 141.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid., p. 142.

that is, a distortion of the essential relatedness of all entities and God. Because humans were originally created for communion with God, the "fundamental human craving is to belong, to count in the community of being, to have one's freedom in and with the response of others, to enjoy God as one who makes us members of one society."[54] The temptation for sin arises from the anxiety that one might not belong, that this craving for communion will not be met in actuality. The craving to belong leads to a natural affinity for the groups and societies of which one is a part, but intense anxiety about the internal and external threats to one's belonging.

Williams says that this anxiety leads to two perversions of love. It leads one to feel protective about his/her groups and to desire to defend them against all threats. The love of one's groups leads to rejection of those within or outside one's groups who are perceived as threats. Thus love becomes hatred of others who look like dangers to one's sense of belonging. It is from love of family, class, nation, that the deep hatreds of racial prejudice, war, and genocide arise. Such murderous hatred is perverted love.

At the same time, Williams suggests that the sense of belonging to the larger world is never lost. The hatred which is used as an instrument to defend one's own groups is fueled by resistance against this sense of belonging to the world as a whole.

> The more deeply we crave a human relationship to those excluded from the present circle, the more powerful must be the resistance to it. The fury of hatred is born in part out of the need to resist in the self what we really crave in love and communion.[55]

---

[54]Ibid., p. 146.   [55]Ibid., p. 148.

One hates those who threaten one's community both as a protection of the in-group, and as a protection against involvement with those outside the in-group. Both are a perversion of the basic drive to be related which God has created. Williams has given some hints on how love which is the essential drive of human nature is perverted by the will into hatred and murder. Sin is the willful rejection of communion with others, usually in the name of defending communion. Williams calls this a form of self-betrayal and self-destruction. Since humans are created for communion, the rejection of this relationality is a betrayal of one's essential nature. In betraying one's own nature, one also betrays others whose destinies are intertwined with one's own.

In summary, Williams says that essential human nature is communion in freedom. God lures humans to use their freedom to affirm the relationality of human experience and move toward a unified world. However, the character of life includes uncertainty about the future. There is risk that our needs for belonging will not be met. Anxiety about this risk is the temptation to sin. In sin, persons choose to create forms of pleasure and satisfaction which are immediate, even if it means the sacrifice of the future goal of a fulfillment which is larger. In order to protect oneself, one rejects others.

> It is not a long step in the logic of emotion to will to destroy the sensitivity of life itself, to turn against ourselves and everything which symbolizes full humanity. We kill what we love because we refuse to love on the terms which life gives.[56]

Sin is the willful turning against life in communion, the perverted search for love. In a self-centered search for belonging, sin destroys the very fabric of life and love which is sensitivity and creativity.

_____

[56]Ibid., p. 153.

Doctrine of Sin

Sin is the perversion of love. Sin is the distortion of the essential communion and freedom of the human spirit. The occasion for sin arises in the ambiguity of life. Humans exist in an existential predicament of which ambiguity is a major characteristic. In each moment of experience there is ambivalence of feeling as the many causal factors make their claims and this results in a mixture of motives in each decision. This ambivalence continues and is magnified as individuals work together in enduring societies. In addition, sensitivity to relationships tends to pull persons toward collectivity and submersion in the group, while creativity tends to push toward instability and isolation of individuals. There is ambiguity in keeping a balance between the social and personal dimensions of life. Then there is the ambiguity as the mixture of good and evil. The concrete life of every person contributes to and detracts from the creative advance of the world, and the good and evil cannot be separated without destroying the person since they arise from the same energies. The ambiguity of life means that the essential forms of love which have been described do not exist in their pure forms in concrete life. They remain ideals for which persons strive in the midst of life's ambiguities, and which have their own ambiguous relationship to concrete life.

Ambiguity is one of the terms on which we receive life. Williams suggests that these terms are not acceptable or comfortable for persons.

> We are created for communion with God and our neighbor in a life which offers communion on terms which require courage and trust in a future we cannot see, which postpones fulfillment and does not allow every kind of immediate gratification. When we discover the

risks involved in being human in the great community we are anxious,
and when we do not find the hope of communion we are desperate.[57]

Living in the midst of life's ambiguity requires courage and
wisdom which is demanding. These terms lead to anxiety that one might
not experience the communion that one desires, and this provides the
temptation to sin. Every person is tempted to grasp at whatever value
can be obtained without consideration for the future of the self, others,
or God. Thus it is the craving for love that is perverted into sin, the
rejection of the terms upon which the promise of love is received.

Love is sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others,
and God and creativity which moves toward enlarged freedom for self,
others, and God. Sin is the perversion of love. It is the denial of
loving sensitivity and loving creativity.

Denial of loving sensitivity. Sin is the denial of loving
sensitivity, the turning away from communion with self, others, and God.
Sin is the willful decision of the individual to value down the relational
aspects of life with its consequence of smaller size for all individuals
and the totality of the world.

In terms of the self, sin is the denial of communion with one's
concrete nature, one's physical feelings. Psychology speaks of being out
of touch with one's feelings, by which they mean a lack of awareness of
one's emotions, one's bodily and relational sensations. It is one form
of defense mechanism which minimizes, in the short run, the suffering
which comes from being open and vulnerable to such relationships. However,
in the long run, it results in alienation from one's real self which is

---

[57]Ibid.

relational. The denial of loving sensitivity is sin as a betrayal of one's true self.

In terms of others, sin is the denial of significant interaction with others. Significant interaction is the openness to receive the physical feelings of others into the constitution of one's own being. However, there is risk and pain in such openness to others, and one response to this pain and risk is to trivialize others as an influence in one's becoming. As Williams has suggested, this sometimes takes the form of prejudice toward outsiders on the pretense of defending against threats to one's own group. At other times it is the distancing of oneself from one's primary relationships as a form of self-protection. In either case the result is alienation from others with the resulting split in the web which holds all persons in relationship.

In terms of God, sin is the denial of the physical influence of God on one's becoming. It is the decision to trivialize the feelings of God as constitutive factors in one's being. How does one block God from one's life? One blocks God out of one's life, first, by trivializing the physical feelings received from others which make up the self. Lack of sensitivity to self and others is also lack of sensitivity to God since God is found in the concreteness of life. Within the concreteness of life, sin is specifically the decision to trivialize the drive toward unity and value in the world. To the extent that one makes decisions which alienate oneself from others, the drive toward unity and value in the world is hampered. This is the way that one can close out not only individual others, but the reality of God from one's life. Sin as a denial of sensitivity to God is a decision to close oneself off from the essence of life and the directionality of the world. Such decision

protects one from suffering with others and with God in the pain that comes from trying to build a cohesive world, but it also cuts one off from the possibility of life itself, and thus is a decision for death. There is a sense in which every person makes such decisions in real life which raises the question of redemption, the topic of the next section.

Denial of loving creativity. Sin is the denial of loving creativity, the rejection of enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. Sin is the willful decision of an individual to value down the freedom of life with its consequence of smaller size for all individuals and God.

In terms of the self, sin is the denial of responsibility for the measure of freedom one has.

> We refuse to believe that life is good and worthy for us as we really are, that our small margin of freedom with all its risks makes the difference between fulfilling life and destroying it. Sin is unbelief and here it is unbelief in ourselves.[58]

In order to deny responsibility for one's freedom, persons tend to blame their problems and difficulties on their relationships, or to submerge themselves so totally in the group that individuality is lost. Blaming is a common behavior based on the fact that we are created from our relationships. It is a way of placing all responsibility on others for what life has dealt us, and refusing to use our own measure of freedom to effect a change in these relationships. In its more severe forms, the denial of responsibility leads to the "abandonment of personal freedom and judgment to the passions of group loyalty and idolatry."[59]

------

[58] Ibid., pp. 150-151.   [59] Ibid., p. 146.

One fears the solitariness and responsibility of creativity and so gives up all autonomy to the group mind.

In terms of others, sin is the denial of enlarged freedom for others. Fear of creativity in others leads to various forms of control by individuals and groups. Psychotherapies have various theories about how persons learn to manipulate and control one another in order to eliminate unpredictable behavior in the other. There are passive and aggressive ways of accomplishing this control, often under the guise of love and protection. Much control of creativity is done through groups through various expectations and norms. Deviations are punished through scapegoating or banishment from the group. Control which is designed to stifle creativity is sin and results in smaller size for individuals and groups.

In terms of God, sin is the attempt to control God's freedom. Sin is the attempt to domesticate God so that God is compatible with the values and goals of one's own group. God created by the group has a size which corresponds to the limited vision of the group, and any intervention by God which does not fit the prescribed expectations is rejected. Thus the freedom of God is circumscribed and controlled for the benefit of conformity and stability. This moves toward smaller size for God and the world.

In summary, sin is the human response to the ambiguity of life which denies loving sensitivity and loving creativity. Sin is the perversion of love, and receives its strength from love. Sin is the willful decision of the free individual to deny the essence of its being and to decide against the directionality of the world toward increased value. As such it is a major obstacle to the increase of size in the world.

Redemption

> Communion is another word for love. Man is created for communion but he loses it and he loses the power to recover it. If we believe that in spite of man's failure love can be recovered we have the triple theme of the Christian gospel. Man bears the image of God who is love. Man's love falls into disorder; but there is a work of God which restores man's integrity and his power to enter into communion. Every Christian theology is an elaboration of this theme.[60]

The triple theme of the gospel is that there was an essential communion in the world which was disrupted by human sin. But the action of God in Jesus Christ has restored the possibility and the power of communion. So far this paper has described the essential character of human existence as social and personal, and the essential character of love as communion and enlarged freedom. Human sin, in response to the ambiguity of life, is a perversion of this love. What remains is to describe the historical and continuing action of God which restores the possibility and reality of love in human life, which is traditionally called redemption.

The Christian gospel is Christocentric, that is, Christians believe that historic change occurred in Jesus Christ which redeemed human life. Loomer refers to the Bible as the story of the covenant relationship between Israel and God. The culmination of the Bible comes in Jesus Christ who reveals the true meaning of this covenant relationship.

> The Bible means many things for various people. One of its most important functions consists in its being a record of the tortuous evolution in a people's understanding of the nature and meaning of the basic divine-human covenant relationship. This evolution and this tradition culminated in the person of Jesus whose life and work and teaching, according to the early church, were of such stature that the heights and depths of the meaning of the covenant had been made known, the heart of God and the spirit of man had been revealed, and both man and God were defined in terms of their involvement in the web of the covenantal kingdom. The relational life or the

---

[60]Ibid., p. 130.

interdependent life of the kingdom was envisioned and embodied. The cross and the resurrection set forth both the price and the recreative power of this kind of life--for God and man alike.[61]

Here Loomer refers to the once-and-for-all character of the Christ-event-- that a stature was revealed in Jesus which remains the model for value and size today. In Jesus the maximum contrast and harmony was present, and thus his very existence in history has set a new standard for the stature of the world.

> The suffering servant is rather one who has sustained a relationship involving great contrast, in this case the incompatibility between love and hate. In absorbing the hate or indifference derived from the other, while attempting to sustain the relationship by responding with love for the other, the extreme of contrasts is exemplified. This contrast is an incompatibility, in fact an emotional contradiction. But by having the size to absorb this contradiction within the integrity of his own being, and in having the strength to sustain the relationship, the incompatibility has been transformed into a compatible contrast.[62]

Through Jesus, God introduced novelty into the world. In Jesus, God revealed the possibility and the reality of an internal relationship which returned love for hate. This provides a new potential for harmony and intensity in the world, and makes concrete a new level of qualitative richness. What was introduced by God in Jesus Christ is now a part of the history of the world, and can be reproduced in the lives of individuals now. God acted in Jesus Christ to restore the essential nature of human life, and Jesus is the model today for the life of great stature.

God continues to act in history to redeem human life and to move the world toward greater stature. Williams speaks of this continuing work in terms of reconciliation. "The Christian faith is that a decisive

---

[61] Loomer, "Size," pp. 26-27.

[62] Loomer, "Two," p. 28.

action of God in a human life has brought redemption, and has begun a new

history of reconciled and fulfilled life."[63]

The incarnation means that a new level of communion between the

human and divine occurred in Jesus. Jesus is the man who lived the life

of love, a life that was free, and which had unbroken communion with God.

This incarnation heals the breach between the human and divine in a new

way in history, and makes possible the atonement between God and all

creation. Through Jesus, God has healed the brokenness in the human-

divine relationship and made reconciliation a reality. Thus atonement is

reconciliation, and is a continuing work of God in human life. Williams

shows how an analysis of human reconciliation provides an analogy to the

reconciliation between God and humans. The possibility of reconciliation

is the direct result of God's action in Jesus. For Williams the basis

of reconciliation is the suffering of Jesus which reveals the suffering

of God.

> We say, then, that the suffering and dying of Jesus is at the
> centre of the redemptive action we call atonement. The cause of
> Jesus' suffering is sin and the human predicament. He meets that
> situation by bearing what has to be born that the work of love may
> get done. God in Jesus Christ suffers with his world, not meaning-
> lessly but redemptively. He has inaugurated a new history by an
> action which restores the possibility of loyalty in this broken,
> suffering, yet still hopeful human community.[64]

Atonement as reconciliation has four phases which are revealed in

the work of Jesus and which continue in the world today. First is the

disclosure of the truth of brokenness and alienation in the world.

Reconciliation depends on the acknowledgment that communion is not a

reality. "All sin involves some kind of dishonesty, a self-deception

---

[63]Williams, Spirit, p. 155.   [64]Ibid., pp. 185-186.

about our real motives, and a distortion of the truth about others."[65]

Much of Jesus' ministry was spent in uncovering the depths of sin for his

hearers. The first step in reconciliation today is the disclosure of the

truth of the human predicament and the reality of sin.

The second phase of reconciliation is loyalty and suffering. In

order for the brokenness of human life to be overcome, there must be an

action of loyalty which occurs in the midst of sin. This action occurs

through one whose stature is large enough to be loyal and loving in the

midst of the rejection and hatred. Jesus was such a person who had the

strength to suffer without refusing love in return. Because Jesus accom-

plished such stature, such reconciliation has a history in the world

through the church and individuals and it is a possibility in the

concreteness of life in the present.

The third phase of reconciliation is the restoration of language

as an instrument of forgiveness between persons. "There is a point in

personal relationships where only the direct word, spoken and heard, can

be adequate for the forgiveness and renewal of reconciliation."[66] Jesus

spoke such words, and thus restored their power in the world. The words

of forgiveness have power to reconcile today when spoken in faith.

The fourth phase of reconciliation is the creation of a new

community. The work of God in Jesus created the church as a continuing

agent of reconciliation in the world.

> The Church is the creation of the atoning action of God. This
> reconciling action continues and is known wherever God's love
> transforms the disfigured life of humanity with the power of a loyal
> and forgiving spirit.[67]

---

[65]Ibid., p. 177.   [66]Ibid., p. 186.   [67]Ibid., p. 187.

On the one hand, the church is the institution which has an historic connection with the historical Jesus. On the other hand, the church exists wherever love is restored in human relationships and reconciliation occurs in the divine-human relationship.

In summary, God took decisive action in Jesus Christ to effect reconciliation in the broken web of life. This action began a new history of love in which the possibility of communion in freedom is made real. This history can be identified as the evolution of the human spirit toward greater stature in which the incompatible contrasts of love and hate are harmonized into an internal relationship governed by love. This history of reconciliation is made possible by God's action in Jesus.

Redemption involves not only the action of God, but also human response. The mutuality of the relationship between God and the world means that redemption depends not just on the unilateral action of God, but also on the responsive action of humans. The human response to God's action in Jesus Christ and God's continuing action through the Holy Spirit is faith. Faith is the decision of an individual to trust God and to live with courage and obedience in the midst of the brokenness of life. For Loomer, faith is expressed as an attachment to life and a willingness to risk deeply internal relationships. Attachment to life is:

> . . .a persistent and spirit-testing commitment to the specific
> processes of life. . . . a "discerning immersion in what is most
> deeply present at hand and concretely at work in our midst.". . .
> The discipline of this way of life involves the most mature
> sensitivity to the workings of concrete processes in the context of
> internal relations.[68]

Faith is the willingness to attach oneself to the concrete processes of life in spite of the ambiguity which is present there. Jesus is the

_____

[68] Loomer, "Size," p. 17.

model of one who was able to sustain deeply internal relationships with individuals and societies in spite of great incompatibilities. Those who live in faith risk following the example of Jesus in attempting to sustain deeply internal relationships with others, and to struggle with courage to harmonize the deep contrasts found there, even the contrast between love and hate. For Williams, faith is trust in God in the midst of betrayal.

> In faith the Church knows itself as founded upon what God has done in the human situation riddled with betrayal. He has moved within the betrayal to show his love as reconciling power. The Gospel is that this love can be trusted absolutely and cannot be destroyed.[69]

Faith is the decision to trust in love, even though one is anxious about the ambiguity of life, and tempted to grasp at smaller size for security. Faith is trust in the concrete processes of life without assurances that one will not be betrayed. It is the willingness to suffer, or even to die, rather than to betray one's essential nature, trusting that God will support one when faced with the agony of such decisions. Faith is the decision to love in the midst of hate, and so to be faithful to the saving action of Jesus Christ as revealed in the crucifixion and resurrection.

---

[69]Williams, Spirit, pp. 188-189.

Chapter Four

THE IMPLICATIONS OF A SOCIAL AND PERSONAL
ANTHROPOLOGY IN PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSELING

Introduction

The bifurcation of the social and personal in traditional views

of personality is the central problem of this paper. In the human

sciences, views of human nature begin with the existence of the individual

to which relationships with others are added. In pastoral care and

counseling, this view of human nature leads to a division in love

between self-love and love of others. The doctrine of love is a test of

the problems which result from a split of the social and personal in

anthropology.

In response to this problem this paper has suggested another view

of human nature. Humans are both social and personal in their essential

nature. Human experience is a process of interaction with two

distinguishable phases which have been called sensitivity and creativity.

Sensitivity refers to the process whereby the individual emerges from

its relationships to the past actual world. Creativity refers to the

process whereby the individual decides how to synthesize the many

relationships of the past into a complex unity with its unique stamp and

pass its life on to the future.

For Christians, love is one of the central concepts of faith and

life and is preeminently social. As such it is a good test of whether

this anthropology can help to integrate the social and personal in human

nature. In the field of pastoral care and counseling, the doctrine of love suffers from a division between self-love and love of others which is overcome by reference to God. The process anthropology must be able to conceptualize the relationships between self and others in a more helpful way. This was done in Chapter Three by defining love in terms of communion and enlarged freedom. Love is a quality of interaction which leads to communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. This leads to a greater unity between self, others, and God. Since relationships are internal to personality, decisions which affect self also affect others and God, and decisions which affect others or God also affect the self. In contrast to a doctrine of love as the bridge between persons and with God, love is a way of speaking about value in human experience. Love is that quality of interaction which leads to the increase of value in human experience.

However, in its existential manifestations, love is not always actualized. The freedom of the individual leads to the possibility and reality of sin. Sin is the decision of the individual which does not lead to communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. Sin is a perversion of love, therefore, and a distortion of the drive toward increased value in the world. The Christian gospel describes the essential nature of God and humans as love. This love is perverted by individual decision into sin. The work of God in Jesus Christ provides a redemption of love in human life through forgiveness and reconciliation and a life of faith in the new community of the church.

The process anthropology with its social and personal aspects provides a helpful way of understanding the Christian gospel of love. In human life social relationships are internal without destroying personal

freedom. Thus love is free from its task of creating a basis for rela-

tionships and can serve as a way of identifying value. The change in

anthropology has healed the divisions of love at the essential level and

provides new ways for understanding the Christian gospel.

This paper has identified a problem in psychological theories of

personality, traced their influence in the field of pastoral care and

counseling, and showed how the doctrine of love is a test of the

consequences of an individualistic anthropology. A solution to this

problem was found in a view of human nature which is social and personal

in its essential aspects, and this led to a reformulation of the doctrine

of love. This last chapter will focus on the implications of this

research for the field of pastoral care and counseling.

Definition of Pastoral Care and Counseling

Up to this point pastoral care and counseling has been defined

simply as a collection of literature concerned with the integration of

discoveries of modern human science into the ministry of the Christian

church. This chapter requires a more careful definition.

According to Browning, the long history of pastoral care since

the formation of the Christian church has included two basic concerns:

1) the socialization of persons into the belief and life-style of the

church; and 2) the response of the church to the personal crises of

persons.[1] Histories of pastoral care, such as the one by McNeill,[2] show

---

[1]Don S. Browning, The Moral Context of Pastoral Care (Phila-
delphia: Westminster, 1976), p. 20.

[2]John T. McNeill, A History of the Cure of Souls (New York:
Harper, 1951).

a predominance of interest in church discipline and restoration of fallen members for most of this history. While response to personal crises was obviously occurring, there is no literature on this subject. Hiltner shows how one pastor did pastoral care under his theology of evangelism.[3]

It was through the influence of the human sciences in this century that response to personal crises became an organized concern of the church, mainly in American Protestantism. Literature since 1936 has shown a serious attempt to adapt the theory and technique of the human sciences to the ministry of the church in ways that are consistent with the theology of the church. This interaction between ministry and the human sciences has been creative and has contributed to the life of the church at many levels.

Within the long history of pastoral care, modern pastoral counseling is relatively young and still growing as a field. Several issues are at the growing edge. First, much of the literature remains concerned with the basic competence of response to the crises of individuals. Given the complex problems that individuals develop in response to modern society, the field asks about the best ways to understand and respond to such problems. New research is constantly being done which provides new and more effective ways to understand and respond to human trouble, and it takes considerable effort to keep up with the wealth of new research in the human sciences.

Second, the field is concerned with the relationship of theology and the human sciences. In the background of this discussion is the

---

[3]Seward Hiltner, Preface to Pastoral Theology (New York: Abingdon, 1957), pp. 72ff.

memory of the time when theology dominated and prevented openness to the

human sciences. The more lively debate currently centers around whether

the church is too uncritical in its use of the human sciences, and whether,

in the process of adapting techniques, especially from psychotherapy,

theology becomes reductionistic.[4] This debate about the relationship of

theology and the human sciences reveals a lack of consensus on a

methodology for relating these two disciplines.

Third, there are questions on the context of pastoral care. The

critique has been developed that pastoral counseling is often abstracted

from its context in the history of the church and from the larger social

context. This results in a technique which is oppressive rather than

liberating. Minority groups and feminists charge that pastoral counseling

often treats the individual in isolation and overlooks the extent to which

individual problems are a reflection of larger social oppression and

therefore cannot be solved on an individual level. Browning has raised

a related issue of whether pastoral counseling can be effective without

a normative moral context. He argues for moral inquiry which will

establish norms for the church from which counseling can be done. One

result of this process would be the broadening of pastoral counseling to

include the larger concerns of traditional pastoral care, i.e.,

socialization of persons into the church as well as response to individual

crises. Whether such norms can be established in a pluralistic world is

one of the debated questions.

The following definitions will guide the discussion in this

chapter.

---

[4]Browning, Moral, p. 18.

>Pastoral counseling is the ministry of the Christian church which uses the resources of theology and the human sciences to respond to the personal crises of individuals within the social context of which they are a part.

>Pastoral care is the ministry of the church which includes pastoral counseling, and also includes the socialization of persons into the belief and life-style of the church community.

These definitions pick up the three issues just discussed: effective response to individual crises, integration of theology and the human sciences, and the context of care in the church and the world. Responding adequately to each of these issues would go beyond the scope of this paper. Rather brief sections will indicate how the process anthropology and the resulting doctrine of love develops a perspective which can make a contribution to the field. The rest of this chapter will be organized around three headings: The Context of Pastoral Care; Pastoral Care as Theology; Pastoral Counseling as Response to Personal Crises.

The Context of Pastoral Care

Critique. An anthropology which starts with the existence of the individual has a tendency to focus on intrapsychic dynamics and to minimize the social context as a factor in the constitution of the individual. Wise focused on psychological needs, the drive for growth, and the drive for integration, all of which are intrapsychic. The main function of the environment is to satisfy or frustrate these needs. Johnson focused on the person who exists at the center of four kinds of relationships. "He is interacting with the biological, physical, social, and ideal relationships at the same time in complex and often conflicting needs and interests."[5] The person is the center of the world and the

---

[5]Paul E. Johnson, Personality and Religion (Nashville: Abingdon, 1957), p. 233.

relationships are secondary. Such an individualistic anthropology leads to an emphasis on the personal rather than the social aspects of personality. This emphasis has led to the criticism that pastoral counseling is not realistic about the extent to which individual problems are an expression of larger social issues.

Liberation Theology is critical of pastoral counseling because it treats individuals within the prevailing cultural norms and locates pathology within the individual. This means that the church helps people to adjust to the present cultural realities without consideration for issues of injustice and oppression. They accuse pastoral counseling of being basically conservative rather than prophetic. Injustice is perpetuated because issues of racism, oppression of women, and the powerlessness of poverty are not addressed. Browning develops a similar critique by suggesting that pastoral counseling deceives itself into thinking that it can function without norms.[6] In the midst of the pluralism of modern society, pastoral counselors have abdicated their role as clergypersons with responsibility for the morality of the culture. Thus pastoral counseling is captive to the fads of the culture, and is rootless and impotent in offering real help to persons in need.

While an argument could be made that this critique is unfair of individual pastoral counselors, it is true that the individualistic assumptions about human nature have led to a lack of emphasis on the social aspects of experience. An anthropology which is social and personal will bring changes in pastoral care. According to this view of human nature, an individual emerges from relationships in the world, and then adds its

_____

[6]Browning, Moral, pp. 11, 18.

unique perspective to these relationships. A moment of human experience is characterized by sensitivity and creativity. This has two implications for pastoral care. First, every person is a perspective on the world and brings the world into every relationship. Second, every person is free and unique and creates the world by his/her decisions. Each of these implications will be considered separately.

Person as perspective. Every person is a perspective on the world and brings the world into every relationship. A moment of experience is created from the many relationships to the past actual world. Physical feelings from past occasions come to a focus in the present occasion and are synthesized into a complex feeling for the future. This is the many becoming one, and being increased by one. In an actual entity, the world becomes one, and the one is a perspective on the world. The world is present in the one as a perspective. The one is the world from a particular perspective.

One way to discuss this reality is to point to the many levels of the world that are present in an occasion of experience. It is easiest to understand how our experience is a synthesis of all the occasions that make up our bodies. Signals from each cell in the body are sent to a processing center where the information creates present consciousness. Given the complexity of this process, it is understandable how these intrapsychic dynamics can become the focus of long-term psychotherapy. Each moment of experience is a perspective on what has happened in the body and the brain including its memory of past events.

The next level is face-to-face relationships with other persons. While mechanical analogies do not hold up here as within the body, persons do know themselves to be profoundly influenced by relationships to family

and friends. Mead's description of the conversation of gestures is helpful here.[7] Individual behaviors influence others, and others influence the individual. As persons speak with their voices and talk with their bodies, they join with others in common social acts which define their experience at that moment. Others become a part of the experience of the individual. By sharing common attitudes and feelings, persons create experience for one another. Thus a person is a perspective on the face-to-face relationships within which he/she lives.

The more difficult to understand, but no less profound, is the way in which each moment of experience is a perspective on the larger world at many levels. In every moment persons are influenced by events and patterns of the larger society. According to Mead, institutions are organized patterns by which "the whole community acts toward the individual under certain circumstances in an identical way."[8] Institutions become internal to the experience of the individual as the institutional attitudes correspond to individual attitudes.

> · · Thus the institutions of society are organized forms of groups or social activity--forms so organized that the individual members of society can act adequately and socially by taking the attitudes of others toward these activities.[9]

Institutions such as education, politics, economics, have a direct influence on the individual. Another example of how larger social systems are internal to the experience of the individual is the givenness of language.

> Only in terms of gestures as significant symbols is the existence of mind or intelligence possible; for only in terms of gestures which

---

[7] George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self, and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 42ff.

[8] Ibid., p. 167.   [9] Ibid., pp. 261-262.

are significant symbols can thinking--which is simply an internalized
or implicit conversation of the individual with himself by means of
such gestures--take place. The internalization in our experience of
the external conversations of gestures which we carry on with other
individuals in the social process is the essence of thinking; and
the gestures thus internalized are significant symbols because they
have the same meanings for all individual members of the given
society or social group. . . .[10]

The words and concepts which form thoughts and make intelligence possible
are given to the individual and continually changed by the culture and
the subcultures in which one lives. Through language the world is
present in individual experience in each moment, and experience at the
level of self-consciousness is possible only through language. Thus the
largest social structures are internal to the experience of the individual.

Every person is a perspective on the world, and because
relationship to the world is internal to experience, every person brings
the world into every relationship.

Person as unique, free and creative. Every person is free and
unique and creates the world by his/her decisions. The personal aspect
of experience consists of the freedom to decide how to synthesize the many
into a unity. In a moment of experience the immediate past is given.
However, an essential aspect of experience is the freedom to choose
between alternative possibilities for the future. The many relationships
of the past can be synthesized in various ways, and each occasion must
choose between these possibilities, only one of which can be actualized.
In many moments the alternatives may be trivial and the limits to one's
freedom restricted. In other moments the choice may be that of life and

---

[10]Ibid., p. 47.

death. The human adventure consists in increasing the possibilities in the future for greater communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God.

Whitehead gives an account of the internal constitution of experience on at least five levels. At the most trivial level a person has the choice to value up or down any relationship to the past world. It is the decision to be attentive to a feeling from another or to ignore that feeling. The second level of freedom is reversion or the consideration of new forms which are not present in the gestures that are received. This requires some imagination to consider alternatives to the physical feelings as received. The third level of freedom is called transmutation, which is the ability to respond to the complexity of the past as if it had unity. A door is a complex nexus of occasions with size, weight, color, and other characteristics. But a person can respond to a door as if it had the single purpose of providing or limiting access to a room, and thus avoid the distraction of responding to its complexity in each interaction. Transmutation may also enable interaction to occur between persons and institutions, even societies as large as a nation, as if they were actual entities.

Greatest freedom comes at the levels of propositional and intellectual feelings. Most of our language and other interaction occurs at this level. A propositional feeling is the combination of a physical feeling with a form. An intellectual feeling is the integration of a propositional feeling with an actual entity or a society. In non-technical terms, propositional and intellectual feelings refer to interaction in which thoughts or feelings are put into language and become gestures between persons. Through human intelligence, persons can

imagine contrasts between what has been received and what is possible. Such contrasts can be tested in interaction through language, and can eventually be actualized through mutual commitment to a course of action. This ability to conceptualize contrasts between what is and what is not actual leads to great potential freedom for persons. It is confirmed by Mead's discussion of mind. Mind is the internalization of the conversation of gestures and the ability to delay action while alternative responses are considered. This makes possible the conceptualization of contrasts, and contrasts of contrasts, and gives increased power in the future. In any one moment, such freedom may be trivial because the relevant possibilities are limited and the causal efficacy of the past is overwhelming. In another, such freedom may be significant and have long-term consequences. For example, the decision of the president of a nation to declare or not declare war may have far-reaching consequences for the entire world. The freedom of a person means that one is not totally bound to the past, and one has a measure of influence over the future.

Four social systems. Every person is a product of the world, and is also a producer of the world. A person is the world from a unique perspective and every decision of a person creates a new world. Therefore an individual cannot be abstracted from the social context and be fully understood. Given this view of human nature, what is the context of pastoral care? In any event of ministry each person is a product of and a producer of the world. This must be taken into account on at least four levels.

1. Intrapsychic System. Every person is a complex intrapsychic system with preferred patterns of interaction with the world. Psychology has explored this system in some detail. Persons have certain feelings, thoughts, habits, intuitions which are familiar because of one's history of interaction with the world. These patterns of interaction are transferred from the past to the present in ways that may or may not be appropriate. The intrapsychic system provides a rich resource for understanding individuals and for developing strategies for change. The intrapsychic system has the character of being the product of the world, as well as a source of freedom for changing the world. The Freudians are right in emphasizing the strong deterministic factor in the development of the intrapsychic system. In formative years of a person's life when freedom is not well developed, the causal forces of the physical body and the intimate relationships with parents and others shape the personality into a pattern of behavior which is transmitted throughout life. Often the personality structure from the past seems to have overwhelming causal efficacy. However, psychoanalysts insist that however powerful the intrapsychic system is in determining present attitudes and behavior, deep insight within the therapeutic alliance can provide an increased measure of freedom. This enables even severely damaged persons to regain some control over their lives and make a contribution to the world.

In pastoral care, the intrapsychic system of a person must be taken into account. This means taking seriously the history of a person's life in shaping present perceptions and preferences and in minimizing or maximizing the potentialities for the future.

2. System of Primary Relationships. The second level of the context for pastoral care is the system of primary relationships within

which a person lives. Every individual is a member of a system of relatives and friends who provide opportunities for face-to-face interaction on a regular basis. Family therapists have discovered the impact that these systems have on the feelings and behavior of individuals. As persons interact with one another over time to accomplish the basic tasks of providing for physical and emotional needs, they develop habitual patterns of interaction. As Mead says, interaction becomes significant as the persons in a social act develop common symbols and meanings and develop similar attitudes. Many of these significant symbols are received from the culture in terms of language and other forms of communication. But many symbols are idiosyncratic to a particular system.[11] Persons with a long history can engage in complex interaction through a single gesture that carries little meaning for an outsider. It is through such significant interaction that the deeper meanings of life are communicated.

Family therapists have shown how individual behavior and emotions are a product of the system of primary relationships. The failure of a system to respond adequately to the changing needs of its members, or to changing circumstances in the world, will result in unhappiness, conflict, and breakdown of the system into rigidity or chaos. The goal of family therapists is change in the system of primary relationships which will enable the individuals to use their freedom in a more creative way in relation to themselves and others. This illustrates the way in which the individual is a product of the system of primary relationships, but also

---

[11]Salvador Minuchin, <u>Families and Family Therapy</u> (Cambridge: Harvard, 1974), p. 52.

can produce change in that system through different responses out of one's freedom.

In pastoral care, the primary relationship system must be taken into account. This means taking seriously the system of relatives and friends which forms the life of the individual and provides a context for the increase of freedom.

3. Larger Social Systems. The third level of the context for pastoral care is made up of the larger systems of society and the world. Individuals are reflections of economic and social class, racial groups, sexual stereotypes, national groups, and many other social indices that can be devised. Polls regularly show that attitudes and behavior of individuals vary according to one's place in the larger society. Mead's description of institutions and language gives us conceptual tools for understanding how larger social systems are internal to the life of the individual.

One of the contributions of Liberation Theology is the emphasis on the influence of larger social structures. Persons and families who are privileged in a society tend to reflect the attitudes of the decision-makers, whether in a democracy or an oligarchy. Those who are oppressed by exclusion from economic participation tend to be determined by their context as well, and manifest their powerlessness in low self-esteem, family breakdown, disease, and high death rates. Feminist thinkers have amassed convincing evidence to show that the exclusion of women from full participation in society and irrational stereotypes have been oppressive in the lives of individual women. They suggest that much of what has been diagnosed as mental illness in women is really the result of social oppression and that many other problems have social rather than

individual causes.[12] Writers in ecology have made a similar point about
the relationship of persons and the natural environment. All of these
thinkers agree that the larger social context must be seen as a causal
force in the lives of individuals, and that many individual problems
cannot be adequately solved without social and cultural change. The
process anthropology of this paper supports this conclusion. Individuals
are the product of the world and must be seen within the total social
context including the largest social systems. Likewise, any changes in
the larger social systems come about through the creative action of
individuals as they exercise their freedom.

In pastoral care the larger social systems of society and the world
must be taken into account. This means taking seriously the natural
ecology, the economic, political, and cultural structures as internal to
the indivdual, and also as a sphere of individual freedom.

4. God. The fourth level of the context of pastoral care is God.
God brings into the experience of the individual the world of worlds, that
is, the perspective which includes every perspective in the universe and
which unifies these perspectives into a unity that transcends every
other perspective. Through God's interaction with every actual occasion,
the individual is a product of the total society of being and the
individual has a direct causal influence on the universe. There is a
sense in which God is the most distant perspective from the individual
because of its all-encompassing nature. At the same time God is the most
intimate of causal factors because God is active at the center of one's
becoming. Theology refers to this dual locus of God as transcendence and

---

[12]Phyllis Chesler, Women and Madness (New York: Avon Books, 1972),
pp. xx-xxiii.

immanence. God is the perspective on the decisions of all individuals in the world, and so transcends the reality of any particular individual of society. As such God includes a perspective which no one can grasp. God works to increase value in the world by influence on individual decisions. God works through concrete actual occasions to enlarge experience for each individual, for society, and for the totality of all societies. Thus God is immanent in the concreteness of individual life. God also receives the free decisions of individuals and takes them fully into account. The individual receives from God and gives back to God. The individual is a perspective of the world, and through God, the perspective of the totality is immediately present in each moment of experience as God acts to influence the individual toward communion and enlarged freedom and then receives the life of the individual as an influence on the totality of all occasions.

The Christian church has developed techniques for helping individuals to be sensitive to the will of God, and of acting in ways that are faithful to the direction God is moving. Through study of the Scriptures, rational theology, study of history, intuitions through prayer and meditation, and seeking the will of the believing community, Christians have sought to discover and obey God's will. Discovering the specific will of God for individuals and societies is a part of the task of pastoral care.

In pastoral care the action of God as the largest perspective in the universe, and as the most intimate causal factor for the individual must be taken into account. This means taking seriously the totality of the world as present in God and internal to the individual, and also as the reality which is influenced by the free decisions of individuals.

Summary. When considered from the view of a social and personal
anthropology, the context of pastoral care includes at least four levels:
1) the intrapsychic system; 2) the system of primary relationships;
3) the larger social systems; 4) the totality of the universe as present
in God and as active through God in the center of experience. An
individual is the many relationships of the world becoming one, and then
being increased by one through the uniqueness and freedom of decisions.
Thus all levels of the universe are simultaneously present in each moment
of experience. The levels interpenetrate and coexist and the individual
cannot interact without involving all levels. A decision to focus on any
level to the exclusion of the others is an arbitrary decision which
abstracts the individual from the full context. There can be no
exclusively intrapsychic, family, social, or religious theory which can
account for all the factors in the creation of the individual. Likewise
no theory which is deterministic is adequate if it does not consider the
freedom of the individual to create the future context. An individual
emerges from the total context and then creates a unique synthesis of these
relationships. An adequate view of human nature must take these aspects
of experience into account in their complexity.

The context of pastoral care is the totality of the universe at
four levels: intrapsychic, family, social, and God. This total context
produces the individual and is produced by the decisions of individuals.
Through sensitivity the world is internal to the individual. Through
creativity the individual is internal to the world. God works at all
levels to bring the concrete world into communion and enlarged
freedom.

Pastoral Care as Theology

The questions. Browning states the problem of the relationship

of pastoral care and theology.

> But if the profession of pastoral care wants to maintain its identity,
> it must be able to demonstrate how its principles of selection are
> internal to the group identity of the church. Pastoral care and
> counseling must be able to show what is "Christian" and "pastoral"
> about what the minister--or the pastoral specialist--does when he
> offers his services. And pastoral care must be able to show that
> what it has borrowed from other disciplines will not corrupt the
> essential thrust of its own unique perspective.[13]

Browning calls pastoral care a subsystem of the church[14] which, though it

may be in creative tension with the church, needs also to have threads of

continuity. Some of these threads may be institutional, such as requiring

ordination of all pastoral counselors, but some must also relate to the

theological identity of the church. Pastoral care must have a theological

orientation which has a relationship to the theology of the church.

1. How does theology inform pastoral care? What understanding

of God and the world provides the basis for responding to the needs of

persons? "What is 'Christian' . . . about what the minister does . . . ?"[15]

Those who would minister to the needs of individuals in the church must

be informed by Christian assumptions about human nature and the nature

of God. Failure to take this task seriously is to minister out of

confusion and to be open to influences which may contradict one's

identity.

2. How are theology and the human sciences related? The human

sciences have provided new insights about human nature and new methods

---

[13]Browning, Moral, p. 19.   [14]Ibid.   [15]Ibid.

for responding to human trouble. These discoveries have been so novel and effective that they must be taken into account by the church. However this creates the problem of whether specific insights from the human sciences are compatible with the theology of the church. If they are not, then both theology and the human sciences must be examined to discover the sources of the incompatibility. The greater danger than the need to change one's theology is that one will adopt incompatible theories and methods which negate the integrity and effectiveness of ministry. As Browning says, pastoral care "must be able to show that what it has borrowed from other disciplines will not corrupt the essential thrust of its own unique perspective."[16]

3. How does ministry inform theology? "Unless pastoral theology is studied, we lose many of the best opportunities with which God has provided us for deepening and correcting our understanding of the faith and that of those we try to help."[17] If God is active in the lives of persons as they struggle with issues of surviving and relating, then ministries that share these experiences are a source of revelation about God's action. To the extent that events of ministry can identify and point to God's presence, pastoral care can be a source of knowledge about God that can deepen and enrich theological understanding. However no clear methodology for making a contribution from pastoral care to theology has been devised.

This section will respond to two of these questions: a) What are the implications of a process doctrine of God for pastoral care,

---

[16]Ibid.   [17]Hiltner, Preface, p. 26.

specifically discovering the will of God for an individual? b) How can one do a form of empirical theology within which theology and pastoral care can inform one another? The final part of this chapter will focus on clinical and research issues raised by this study.

Implications of the doctrine of God. According to the doctrine of God as discussed in Chapter Three, God has three apsects: 1) God is concrete; 2) God is the drive toward unity of the world; (3) God is the drive toward the increase of value in the world. God is transcendent in that God is the perspective which includes all other perspectives. God is immanent in that God is present in the becoming of each individual to give and receive causal influence. God brings to each occasion the perspective of the totality and receives from each occasion the decision which contributes to the perspective of the totality. God's action is consistent in love, but always within the concreteness of the actual occasion. Concreteness, unity, and love are the ways that God is present in actual experience.

An actual occasion is sensitive to God when it moves toward communion with God's concrete action of love for all occasions. An actual occasion is creative according to God's will when it uses its freedom to enlarge the freedom for all occasions. However, a person can use freedom to reject God's will and make decisions which move toward decreased value and size in the world. Pastoral care has the responsi- bility to help persons become sensitive to God's will in their lives and to deal with the perverted will to sin so that decisions faithful to God can be actualized.

The implications of the doctrine of God for pastoral care are based on the premise that God is active in each decision of an individual

occasion of experience. Theology has generally held to the immanence of God in the world, but it has not been clear how God is related to immediate experience. In process theology, God has the metaphysical function of concretely presenting to each occasion those relevant possibilities which will move toward greater value in the world. God's sphere of activity is the concrescence of each actual entity, and God's function is the increase of value for each occasion and the total world. God's function does not depend on human awareness. This is confirmed by the church's view that God works in hidden ways to accomplish God's purposes. Much of God's activity is incognito at levels below human awareness. However the church has also affirmed that faithfulness to God's purposes is enhanced when God's action is raised to awareness. A major thrust of the Scriptures, of the life of Jesus, and of the church through history has been to bring into awareness the will and action of God in the lives of persons and societies. Implicit in this observation is the belief that awareness of God's will increases faithfulness among God's people.

God's will is not a static expectation which can be applied at all times and places. The world process is an adventure which involves God as a participant along with the world. Thus the discovery of God's will is a continual process with variations that are specific to each perspective. Through a long history of seeking God's will, the church has developed clues to God's patterns. But such patterns do not limit God's freedom to seek the full expression of love as it seeks actuality in concrete life. The problem of pastoral care is how to discover the specific will of God for individuals and how to deal with the willful

rejection of God's will which is called sin. The following discussion

reveals the general guidelines of this task for pastoral care.

First, God's will comes to the individual within the social context.

The individual is a perspective on the world, which means that the world

at all levels is internal to the constitution of the individual. God is

present as the perspective which includes all other perspectives in the

world. While the will of God is specific for each individual, it is not

isolated and unrelated to God's will for all occasions. God's will is

a part of the web which drives toward unity for the total world. Even

where there are incompatibilities and contradictions between forms in the

world, God's will seeks that unity which changes these into contrasts that

enhance the intensity of life.

Second, the search for the will of God is not carried out by

individuals in isolation from one another. The Scriptures and the

history of the church both point to the corporate search for knowledge of

and faithfulness to God. The prophets stood against the community of

faith, but used as their authority the covenant between God and the

community. Jesus did much of his teaching in spirited dialogue with the

contemporary religious leaders, and called on their common tradition as

authority for his positions. Browning makes the point that moral inquiry

is one of the functions of the church, and the special calling of its

ordained leadership. The will of God for an individual cannot be identified

apart from this corporate search. "There is a moral context to all acts

of care."[18] By moral context is meant that "care in the Christian context

also should exhibit a kind of practical moral inquiry into the way life

---

[18]Browning, _Moral_, p. 11.

should be ordered."[19] This is the corporate search for the will of God

as it is relevant to the decisions of the individual and the community.

Corporate decisions about value will not necessarily be identical with

value for the individual, and indeed, a corporate search for morality can

be in error and destructive for the individual and the larger society.

But the individual search for God's will is a part of the corporate

search.

Third, discovering the specific will of God for individuals

involves developing sensitivity to God's presence. The individual search

includes the corporate search as its context. Developing awareness of

God is a matter of being attentive to certain aspects of becoming.

According to the process doctrine of God, the aspects of becoming to which

one must be attentive in order to discover God's presence are three:

1) the concreteness of life; b) the drive toward unity and harmony;

c) the drive toward love and increased value. In practical terms this

means being attentive to one's relationships to the world at all levels as

they move toward unity and love. In each moment of experience one

receives contrasts and contradictions which have the possibility to be

synthesized into greater unity and love. God presents to each occasion

the relevant possibilities to concretely increase value in the world.

Searching for God's will means being attentive to the concrete rela-

tionships and the relevant possibilities for maximizing unity and intensity

among them.

The methods for discovering God's specific will for an individual

are many and varied. The church has its set of methods variously called

_____

[19]Ibid., p. 15.

spiritual direction, pastoral care, or pastoral counseling. Secular forms of helping individuals focus on emotional or cognitive aspects of personal life, the social context, can be helpful. The method for empirical theology is directed toward discovering God's will, as in the specific methods of the last section on responding to individuals in crises. Given the research of this paper, the problem with most methods is that they tend to abstract the individual from the total context in order to focus on a part of it, that is, they ignore either the social or personal aspects of human experience, and thus lose a part of the individual in the process. It is hoped that a more adequate anthropology that is social and personal will make available better methods for the human search for God's will.

Within the existential realities of being human, knowing and doing the will of God are not the same. Sin is defined as the willful perversion of love. The testimony of the Scriptures and the church is that one can know God's will and not actualize it. "For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do." (Romans 7:19). This is sin, and the Scriptures say that the human will must be redeemed so that knowledge of God's will can result in faithfulness. Such redemption of the human spirit comes through the action of God's love continually bringing reconciliation and resulting in a life of faith and trust, an attachment to life as the sphere of God's activity.

Pastoral care is theology because God is active as a causal force in each moment of experience. God's action may be hidden from awareness, or may be identified by other language and symbols than theological. In the church, a part of pastoral care is bringing the action of God into awareness. This may occur through the traditional methods of Bible study,

study of theology and history, prayer and meditation, or seeking the
consensus of the believing community. It may occur in corporate settings
or through individual work, or it may occur through the newer methods of
psychotherapy. Accepting an anthropology which is social and personal
and perceiving God as active in each moment of experience may free
pastoral care to see itself as theology.

     <u>A model for empirical theology</u>. Pastoral counseling was defined
as "the ministry of the church which uses the resources of theology and
the human sciences to respond to the personal crises of persons within
the social context of which they are a part." This definition includes
the question of how theology and the human sicences inform events of
ministry and how the events of ministry inform and correct the disciplines
of theology and human sciences. One answer to this question is the
model of empirical theology.

     Since God is active in each moment of experience, and since
persons are internally constituted by relationships to God and others,
events of ministry are a source of knowledge about God. Given the clues
we have from theology and the human sciences, the pattern and content of
God's action can be discovered by careful examination of concrete
events. This can be helpful for individuals seeking the specific will
of God for their lives, and the generalizations from this search can serve
to make a contribution back to theology and the human sciences.

     There are problems with discovering the action of God in concrete
events. God's action is often hidden from human awareness because God
functions at preconscious levels, and because God's influence is not
radically different from the multitude of physical causes which affect

an occasion of experience. Human sin also clouds the search for knowledge of God, and history is replete with examples of those who were sure God was on their side only to discover later that they were sadly and sometimes tragically mistaken. Because God is often incognito and because human sin tends to find the answers it wants, knowledge of the will of God is a difficult thing to discover.

According to Whitehead, there is another reason knowledge of God is difficult. That is because God is always present in human experience. God is one of the generalizations which characterizes experience in its essence. Most of one's knowledge about the world comes by the "method of difference." That is, knowledge comes by noticing when a thing is present and when it is absent. However, God, as with other generalizations about experience, is never absent, and therefore cannot be discovered by the method of difference. Whitehead suggests that the solution to this difficulty is the use of free imagination.

> The true method of discovery is like the flight of an aeroplane. It starts from the groud of particular observation; it makes a flight in the thin air of imaginative generalization; and it again lands for renewed observation rendered acute by rational interpretation. The reason for the success of this method of imaginative rationalization is that, when the method of difference fails, factors which are constantly present may yet be observed under the influence of imaginative thought.[20]

The "elucidation of immediate experience" occurs when one begins with experience, leaves it to soar in the imagination, and then returns to experience to check whether one perceives the situation differently. One's motivation for speculation is tied directly to immediate experience, and the success of one's speculation is judged by the return to immediate experience.

---

[20]Alfred North Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Free Press), p. 5.

There are different rules for judging the generalizations one

reaches. In their speculative form, they are judged by coherence and

logic.[21] In the concrete situation they are judged by whether they are

applicable and adequate.[22] Two questions must be asked of each generali-

zation. First, does it hold together and make sense without internal

contradiction? Second, does it fit experience and explain experience

adequately?

This idea can provide a basis for an empirical theology. Such

a theology is a process of reaching generalizations about the role of God

and about the specific action of God in immediate experience. One who

does theology in this manner begins with immediate experience, then moves

into the free imagination where logic and coherence are the main

methods, but returns to experience to test the applicability and adequacy

of the discoveries.

God's action cannot be determined from within experience alone

because God is one of the principles of the process of experience itself,

and therefore the "method of difference" yields no information about God.

A theologian is one who moves from experience into the free imagination to

speculate on the action of God in human experience. In this realm one

can bring into play the disciplines of theology and the human sciences.

The main criteria for the development of theory at this phase is coherence

and logic. After an exercise in the free imagination, the theologian

must return to experience to test the adequacy and applicability of the

conclusions reached. Whitehead says that "the success of the imaginative

experiment is always to be tested by the applicability of its results

_____

[21]Ibid., p. 3.   [22]Ibid.

beyond the restricted locus from which it originated."[23] In order for theology to be helpful its conclusions must be tested in human experience, and in broader experience than that which prompted the imagination in the first place.

How would the method of empirical theology work in pastoral care? When a person comes to see a pastor because of a personal crisis, the first task is empirical observation. This means trying to put oneself inside the situation of the person in order to feel his/her feelings, i.e., sensitivity. When a person comes for help, the feelings usually include pain and frustration because of some problem. A pastor must feel these feelings and develop empathy for the person.

However, if the pastor does nothing but feel the feelings of the person who came for help, nothing new will occur in the interaction to bring change. If the pastor only stays in the empirical situation with the person, there will be no reflection on the meaning of the experience in a broader context. Both pastor and person would be caught and controlled by the causal efficacy of the past, and the imagination necessary to bring change would not be available.

The second step in the process is to move into the phase of free imagination about the experience. The immediate experience must be transcended if change is to occur. Daniel Day Williams develops three generalizations about the presence of God in pastoral counseling which may help one to see how searching for God's will may be helpful in a situation of personal crisis. First, each immediate situation provides

_____

[23]Ibid., p. 5.

the potential for moving from immediate needs to ultimate questions of existence.

> From a Christian point of view, then, human needs must be met on two levels. There is the obvious insistent needs of the body and mind for that which sustains and nourishes. But the immediate problem may be the door through which we walk into the arena where ultimate questions are asked and answered. The search for therapy is transmuted into the question for salvation.[24]

One may move with a person from the immediate question of pain and frustration to the ultimate meaning of the person's existence. Therefore one must be open to clues and signals that any particular crisis in a person's life may move into a crisis of life itself, and the person thus has potential for dramatic growth into new awareness.

Second, Williams suggests that the deeper reality of life is present in the counseling relationship.

> Human relationships are never dyadic, but always triadic. There is a reality which stands between the persons, and that reality, to keep our terms neutral for the moment, is the meaning of existence as it really is . . . . what has taken place has been a transaction not only between herself and the counseling, but with a reality which is neither of them, nor the two together, but that which holds, measures, and justifies them in one world of meaning.[25]

God is involved in every human encounter. It is through God that the relationship occurs and through God that healing is possible. Knowledge of this reality gives the pastor new resources to bring to bear on the counseling relationship.

Third, Williams says that for the Christian the presence of God in the counseling relationship tells us something about God's purposes and goals.

---

[24]Daniel Day Williams, The Minister and the Care of Souls (New York: Harper, 1961), pp. 28-29.

[25]Ibid., p. 66.

> We have offered a Christological interpretation of personal rela-
> tionships. When a broken self finds healing and strength, the healing
> power belongs neither to the self nor to another who acts as
> psychiatrist or pastor. It belongs to a power operative in their
> relationship. That power is God, who as we know him in the Christian
> faith, is revealed to us in Jesus Christ, the Third Man, who
> discloses the truth about our humanity in its needs and in its
> hope.[26]

The truth revealed by God in Jesus Christ is that the basis of all

reality is love. The pastor can move ahead in the counseling relationship

in the faith that the power which will support both of them is the power

of love.

Williams developed three generalizations about the counseling

relationship: that immediate problems may be the occasion for growth at

the level of ultimate values; that there is a power in the counseling

relationship which holds pastor and person together; and that this power

is God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the God of love. These

generalizations must first be treated by their logic and coherence within

the theological disciplines and against the insights of the human

sciences. They then provide hypotheses with which one can return to the

concrete situation and use as the basis for new behavior in the specific

relationship. As the pastor returns to the counseling situation, he/she

can now see the relationship and the problems from a different perspective,

and based on these generalizations can engage in interaction which

brings a greater potential for change. The success of the change will

depend on whether the basis of the new action, the generalizations, is

adequate and applicable to the actual concrete situation. It will also

---

[26]Ibid., p. 71.

depend on the free choice of the two persons involved. Williams identi-

fies this last step as a theological task.

> The pastor must be a theologian, and the kind of practical theologian who can keep theological concepts in significant relation to human experience. . . . The theological skill which is required here is that which can go to the spiritual center of the mass of human feelings and anxiety. It is the capacity to hear and interpret the unarticulated longing of the spirit through the ordinary language and the extra-ordinary language which people use.[27]

This method of empirical theology has three kinds of applications.

First, it describes the process that occurs when pastor and person meet

for interaction around a specific problem. All three phases ordinarily

occur simultaneously as the pastor listens carefully to the person,

reflects on theory, and returns to test generalizations in the inter-

action. It is a method which goes on in the mind of the pastor, and also

a method which is mutually shared by pastor and person. In both ways

the pastor has the responsibility to be disciplined in its use. It is

possible to be careless in each of the phases. The pastor who does not

identify with the person enough will lack the ability to feel the feelings

of the other and will have no basis on which to conceptualize. The

pastor who does not conceptualize well will have little of novelty to

offer as the basis of change. The pastor who does not return from

conceptualizing will not make contact with the person so that change can

be effected.

Second, this method of empirical theology shows how theology and

the human sciences can inform the events of ministry. The resources for

bringing healing to the person do not lie in repeating the past as it is

described by the person. There must be a mechanism for providing

---

[27]Ibid., p. 104.

possibilities for novelty. This mechanism is the use of the free imagination. Here all the resources of any discipline which is relevant are available to help one to understand the concrete experience of the person and to conceptualize the relevant possibilities for new forms. Counseling is primarily a process of offering propositions which create novel ways of synthesizing the past and thus making possible a new future. In order for theology and the human sciences to inform the pastor in this way, the data of the field must be readily at hand and available for use. This will require both theoretical and clinical training on the content and method of theology and the human sciences, and the methods by which these data are relevant to the actual human problems of persons. Training in such methods should be a regular part of ministry in the form of peer groups which work to make theology relevant to the events of ministry.

Third, the method of empirical theology provides a way in which the events of ministry can serve to inform and correct theology and the human sciences. This possibility occurs at two points. The concrete situation presented by the person seeking help is what calls out for help from the theoretical disciplines. Already the concrete event is defining the relevance of the theory. Then the relevance of the theoretical generalizations is tested again in terms of their applicability and adequacy to the concrete situation. To the extent that they are adequate or not, one must return to theory to redesign the formulations. Thus the concrete events of ministry serve to test the theory of theology and the human sciences on the criteria of applicability and adequacy, rather than just logic and coherence.

This model of empirical theology can serve as a research and training method. In some ways it approximates what already happens in this field. A group of pastors come together with a trainer or a researcher and bring events of ministry through verbatims, audio and video tapes, and case studies. The group starts with the empirical data, then uses imagination to bring in the resources of theology and the human sciences, and returns to the data to check for applicability and adequacy. The ongoing insights and conclusions of such a group could be tested in many different events of ministry, and the verified conclusions written up as a way of enriching and correcting the theories of theology and the human sciences and improving the ministry of the church. In this way, pastoral care is informed by theology and the human sciences, and in turn helps to inform these disciplines.

Pastoral Counseling as Response to Personal Crises

The predominant concern of modern pastoral counseling has been response to personal crises. The first experiments at applying the discoveries of the human sciences to ministry occurred in general and mental hospitals. Anton Boisen became interested in mental illness as a personal and spiritual crisis while he was a patient in a psychiatric facility. He studied his own illness and also began observing and interacting with other patients about their experiences. Later he worked as a chaplain in a state hospital and brought theological students to work with him in patient care and to use the events of ministry as a source of theological insight. Meanwhile Richard Cabot, a physician, and Russell Dicks, a minister, were combining the resources

of medicine and ministry to respond to the needs of patients in a general
hospital. They saw the physician and chaplain as a team which could
respond more holistically to the complex needs of a person with physical
and other problems. William Keller took a broader social work approach
which included responding to persons who were affected by larger social
structures, but his work has been less influential on pastoral counseling.
The early drive in pastoral counseling came from trying to use the
resources of theology and the human sciences to respond to individuals
in crisis. While there has been an attempt to broaden the emphasis of
pastoral counseling to include growth opportunities for persons not in
crisis,[28] it would be fair to say that contemporary pastoral counseling
remains centered on effective response to persons who come to a pastor
or a pastoral specialist for help. This section will focus on the
implications of this study for pastoral counseling as response to
personal crises.

Central to the field of pastoral counseling has been the attempt
to adapt the discoveries of the human sciences in ways that are consistent
with Christian assumptions in order that they may be useful to the church.
Most of the successful writers in pastoral counseling have worked to
adapt the secular forms of psychotherapy as forms of ministry. Wise
adapted the theory and methods of psychoanalysis; Johnson tried to inte-
grate the work of Freud, Lewin, Sullivan and Allport; Oates was strongly
influenced by Rogers and Sullivan; Clinebell has made available the work
in humanistic psychology and the human potentials movement.

---

[28]Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Growth Counseling for Marriage
Enrichment (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

The method for adapting theory and technique from secular psychotherapy is as follows. First, one must be clear about one's own assumptions and theology. Second, one must choose a form of psycho- therapy which shares at least some of these assumptions. Thirds, one must adapt the theory and method of the psychotherapy in order to make it consistent with one's own theology. Many of the writers in pastoral counseling have followed this method and their work reflects the struggle to be open to the insights of the human sciences and also consistent with their own roots in Christian theology. This method will be generally followed in this section.

Three conclusions from this study have implications for the theory and practice of pastoral care and counseling.

1. Human experience is a process of interaction characterized by sensitivity, i.e., feeling the feelings of others, and by creativity, i.e., responding to others with new feelings.

Human experience is a part of the process of interaction that includes all becoming in the world, and it has a social and a personal dimension. Human experience is social to the extent that it is created out of sensitivity to others. Relationships form the context and the content of the life of the individual. Human experience is personal to the extent that individuals freely determine their unique synthesis of these relationships in a way that has causal efficacy for the future. In the process of choosing between various possibilities, the individual becomes efficacious in relationships to others. Human experience is processive with social and personal aspects.

Whitehead's contribution to this discussion is his description of how others are internal to the experience of the individual through

physical feelings, and how the individual has freedom to conceive alternative possibilities through conceptual feelings. The process of life is social and personal in its essential nature.

Mead's contribution to this discussion is his description of how others determine the nature of the self through the conversation of gestures and how the development of mind enables the individual to delay response and thus influence the experience of others. The self is made up of the "me" which is created by interaction with others, and the "I" which is the individual's unique response in every interaction. Through the process of interaction, significant gestures are developed through the language and institutions of the culture and are reflected in the common attitudes of individuals. Mead has provided the basic concepts for a social psychology which is processive with social and personal aspects.

Such a view of human nature makes it difficult to accept uncritically forms of psychotherapy which are not processive or which separate the social and personal aspects of experience. Psychoanalytic psychotherapies tend to be nonprocessive and minimize the social aspects. With their strong emphasis on the formative development of personality during early childhood, their work with adults revolves around understanding the set character patterns which determine attitudes and behavior. For them, the past is overwhelming in its determination of the present. The individual tends to react to the present based on learning in early childhood, and this view minimizes the ways in which human experience is an ongoing process which occurs in response to the immediate social context.

The behavioristic psychotherapies tend to minimize the personal aspects of human experience in favor of determination by social forces. They understand human behavior as a direct response to reinforcement from the environment. They underestimate the extent to which individuals are free to determine their responses to others, and they have a narrow view of the social aspect of experience. The individual has significant freedom to choose among available possibilites, and the experience of the individual is the focus of social forces from many levels of the total process.

The humanistic psychotherapies tend to minimize the social and cultural influences in the life of the individual. While they emphasize freedom to take responsibility for present life, they do not show how others are internal to the life of the individual, and how the self is created by its relationships.

The most promising developments in psychotherapy in terms of this paper are the relational psychotherapies, especially in family therapy. Haley and Minuchin have developed a form of psychotherapy which supports the three dimensions of human experience--its processive nature with social and personal aspects. Their work will be reviewed in the next section.

2. Love in human experience is a quality of interaction characterized by sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others, and God, and by creativity which moves toward enlarged freedom for self, others, and God.

Love is the essential goal of life. It is a way of talking about value in human experience. Sensitivity is the social dimension of human

experience. Love is the quality of sensitivity which moves toward communion with self, others, and God. Developing communion with the self is the ability to increase awareness of the concrete physical feelings of one's existence. Developing communion with others is commitment to significant interaction with others and the ability to form and sustain long-term covenants with other persons and groups. God will be discussed later.

Creativity is the personal dimension of human experience. It is the freedom of the person to consider alternative possibilities and to decide how to respond in the midst of social relationships. Loving creativity is a quality of interaction which moves toward enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. Enlarged freedom for self comes as it takes responsibility for its self-creativity and its potential for self-transcendence. Enlarged freedom for others comes when one responds with gestures which show sensitivity and function to enlarge the potential responses of others. God will be discussed later.

Most forms of psychotherapy identify their essential goals with one part or another of this definition of love. There is much emphasis on increased sensitivity to the self, that is, the ability of a person to be "in touch with his/her feelings," congruence between feelings and behavior, increased self-understanding, etc. There is also interest in helping the individual to be more open and sensitive to others as a result of better self-acceptance. The problem in most psychotherapies is the separation between self and others, which is often expressed as placing a priority on self-acceptance and self-understanding as a prerequisite for sensitivity to others. This leads to an intrapsychic orientation which does not provide a good basis for mutuality in

relationships. In this paper, sensitivity to self and others tends to be the same thing since others are internal to the self and form the content of individual experience. Therefore love is sensitivity which moves toward communion with self and others at the same time.

Most psychotherapies are interested in increased creativity for persons. Even the pessimistic psychoanalysts hope that insight will enable the individual to gain better control of neurotic behavior patterns and open up new possibilities for creative response. The humanistic therapies list individual freedom as a primary goal of therapy and rejoice when a person has "found him/herself" and can actualize new possibilities. Even the behaviorists claim that relearning will free the individual from self-destructive behavior and make life more creative. However, again the split of the social and personal often means that individual creativity does not lead to an increase in creativity for others. Individual freedom may lead to more creative relationships, but it may also destroy perception of their own needs. The unification of the social and personal leads to a new conception of freedom in terms of its mutuality and the enhancement of freedom for all.

In order to be useful for clinical and research purposes, the definition of love must be operationalized so that forms of measurement can be applied. While measurement is always inadequate because it too severely limits the definition of love, it must be tried in order to move from the abstract to the concrete. The following is an attempt to operationalize the concept of love according to the above definitions.

> Loving sensitivity is the extent to which an individual or a group can receive into awareness all the conflicting data received in a moment of experience.

The assumption of this definition is that love is that quality of interaction that moves toward increased sensitivity, or the ability to receive into conscious awareness more of the world with greater intensity. In terms of clinical and research purposes, one would try to observe the following kinds of things to see whether the interaction is becoming more or less loving: a) acceptance of feelings and memories from one's own past experiences; b) empathy with the feelings and experiences of others; c) reception of the conflicting feelings from larger social structures; d) being attentive to those feelings with the most contrast.

> Loving Creativity is the extent to which an individual or a group can actualize possibilities that harmonize the contradictions of the past and also maintain integrity.

The assumption of this definition is that love is that quality of interaction that moves toward increased creativity, or the increase of freedom that comes from harmonizing the contradictions of the past. In terms of clinical and research purposes, one would try to observe the following kinds of things to see whether the interaction is becoming more or less loving: a) finding unity and harmony among contradictory feelings; b) imagining alternatives to past and present patterns of interaction; c) sustaining long-term covenant relationships; d) risking chaos for a novel possibility; 3) delaying a novel response in order to be more effective; f) maintaining centeredness in the midst of contrasting feelings.

3. God is an interactant in the experience of individuals and groups.

The discussion of God is not separate from the discussion of love because God is the one who consistently works to actualize love in the

world. But in pastoral care and counseling, the concept and reality of God is central to the therapeutic process itself. God is an objective part of the concrete experience of individuals and groups. God is the one in the world who functions to preserve the unity of all things and to increase value for individuals and for the universe. God works toward this end by presenting the relevant possibilities within the concrete experience of every individual and by making attractive those possibilities which are more valuable.

The presence of God is hidden and revealed. It is hidden because God is experienced as only one of the many causal forces which act upon individual experience and God's will is not presented as clear, distinct, and compelling. The action of God can be confused with other causal forces and its influence minimized by human decision. The presence of God is revealed in experience as the feeling of interdependence with all things, and as the awareness of imaginative possibilities which lure the individual toward greater value. According to the Christian tradition, the will of God can be identified and embraced by those who commit themselves to seeking God's will within the corporate search of the church.

In one sense, the search for the will of God is the same as the search for that which is loving. God is the one which works to increase love in the world. However, the Christian tradition has always believed that the reality of God is transcendent over all human descriptions of love and value. Love within the experience of God is always more than an individual or group can imagine, and thus the human search for love tends to be less than it could be. A search for love according to the will of God tends to move toward a greater depth and intensity than a purely human search could discover. The identification of love and God also

opens up the rich tradition of the search for the love of God in religion, and for Christians connects this search to the ultimate revelation of that love in the life and death of Jesus Christ.

Within the present cultural context, one of the clearest differences between psychotherapy and pastoral counseling is the willingness of pastoral counselors to confess and use the symbol of God as a part of therapeutic work with persons. Given the assumptions of this paper, such a division between secular and religious counseling is not necessary or desirable. One would hope that changes in the philosophical assumptions about human nature and the reality of God will enable all psychotherapists to be open to the presence of God in experience and find ways of using this resource to help persons.

Since God is an objective part of concrete experience, then the presence and will of God can be identified, at least partially, and made available as a source of guidance and support for persons in their growth. This will lead to new clinical and research possibilities. If the reality of God is concrete, then the reality of God can be defined and measured, although not limited. The danger of such definition and measurement is that humans may begin to think they can limit God's reality. Some would say that such dangers rule out any empirical search for God and encourage the sin of pride which prevents a real relationship between the divine and human. The advantage of an empirical search for God is that God's action is brought into sharper awareness at a concrete level when it must be faced and responded to. This has been the goal of the church over the centuries.

Based on the research of this paper, the following definition of God's presence could lead to an empirical search for God's reality.

The presence of God is that feeling in the experience of individuals and groups that the world is a unity and all becoming is inter-dependent, and that awareness of unrealized possibilities which have the potential to bring enlarged freedom into actuality.

Given this definition of God, it should be possible to design instruments which can measure the sensitivity of an individual or a group to the presence of God. At this point the dangers of such a venture become clear. God is more than the feeling of unity and the awareness of unrealized possibilities, and such attempts to make God concrete violate religious intuitions about the transcendence of God. However, discovering the concrete reality of feelings of unity and awareness of unrealized possibilities for a particular person could lead to a significant encounter with God. Attempts to measure sensitivity to God according to the above definitions could focus on the following questions. a) To what extent does a person feel sympathy with and identify with others in his/her primary groups, larger social structures, and very diverse nationalities and cultures? b) To what extent does a person sense that there is unity in the world beyond that which is actual in his/her own experience? c) In a specific moment of experience, what are the unrealized possibilities in the awareness of the individual, and how compelling are these parts of the imagination? d) When contradictions between a person's concrete life and unrealized possibilities occur, what resources does the person draw on to resolve this tension?

The questions parallel the previous discussion about love and its presence in experience. The argument in this section is that the connection between love and God broadens the discussion of value in human life, opens up the centuries of religious intuition and scholarship, and gives a sense of ultimacy to the value of love. Connecting God and

love frees the discussion of love from its purely relativistic context and points to the drive of the universe itself toward love. Increasing sensitivity and creativity in individual experience and in the world is more than an attempt to make life more satisfying for persons. Identifying God and love points to the fact that love is the essential direction of the world process, and actualizing love in human life fulfills the self and contributes to greater size for the world and for God.

In summary, this section has focused on the relevance of this paper for clinical and research purposes. An anthropology which is processive with social and personal aspects points to basic problems in current psychotherapy and opens the possibility of influence from relational therapies. Identifying love as the essential goal of life places the discussion of value in therapy in a different perspective and enables new operational definitions of the goals of therapy. The discussion of God as an interactant in human experience provides a way of connecting love with that which is ultimate in the world and opens up the resources of the religious tradition for use in pastoral counseling.

The structural family therapy of Haley and Minuchin. Haley and Minuchin are clinicians who have arrived at their theory and practice of therapy after many years of experimentation within psychiatric facilities. They are not primarily theoriticians or researchers, but are interested in the most effective ways to help persons who suffer severe pain in their lives. They have concluded that the most effective way to help individuals is to work within family units to bring change in the immediate social context. This section will focus on: a) their definition of the normal family system; b) their

understanding of dysfunction that leads to individual distress; c) their

methods for bringing change in the lives of persons.

The function of a family is to provide nurture and socialization

for its individual members.

> . . . family functions serve two different ends. One is internal--
> the psychosocial protection of its members; the other is external--
> the accommodation to a culture and the transmission of that culture.[29]

This is a common definition of the family in sociology. The important

question for a clinician is how the family accomplishes these goals.

The family is a process of interaction which assumes certain

repetitive patterns in order to accomplish its tasks of supporting the

individuals and socializing them into the culture.

> Family structure is the invisible set of functional demands that
> organizes the ways in which family members interact. A family is a
> system that operates through transactional patterns. Repeated
> transactions establish patterns of how, when, and to whom to
> relate, and these patterns underpin the system.[30]

Some of these patterns are generic, that is, they are required in every

family. For example, there is always a hierarchy that includes a

generational line between parents and children. There must also be a

level of complementarity between the parents as they function as an

administrative unit. However, some of the patterns are idiosyncratic,

that is, they are unique to a particular family and different in every

family. Because of its unique history, each family adapts to its circum-

stances in a peculiar way and maintains its accustomed patterns until

there is need for change. This means that some patterns develop and are

maintained long after the purpose for their existence is forgotten.[31]

---

[29]Minuchin, _Families and Family Therapy_, p. 46.

[30]Idib., p. 51.   [31]Ibid.

Minuchin defines a family as a pattern of interaction which is established over time and which must be flexible to meet changes demanded of it in the future. The family is constantly changing as a structure which is determined by the ways in which people relate to one another. The main form of this family structure is its subsystems. Dyads and triads cooperate for certain functions. The ability to form subsystems with clear, yet not rigid, boundaries is the sign of a normal, healthy family.[32]

For Haley, the key words that describe the functioning of a family are sequence and hierarchy.

> When one is observing people who have a history and a future together, one sees that they follow organized ways of behaving with one another. . . . To be organized means to follow patterned, redundant ways of behaving and to exist in a hierarchy.[33]

Sequence and hierarchy identify the structure of a family. Family members interact within certain repetitive sequences which determine the hierarchy, or the status and responsibilities of each member of the family. The hierarchy is the structure which determines the sequences which are allowed to occur within a particular family. A healthy family is one which has a wide variety of sequences with which to interact, and a flexible hierarchy which can adapt to meet the changing functions of the family.

One of the primary characteristics of a family is homeostatis, i.e., its tendency to maintain itself within its preferred sequence and hierarchy.

> It is in the ways that repetitive sequences define hierarchies that systems theory and hierarchy come together. The hierarchy is shaped by the behavior of the people involved, and insofar as the behavior is

---

[32]Ibid.

[33]Jay Haley, Problem-Solving Therapy (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 100.

repetitive and redundant it is a governed system that is error-activated in that deviance activates a governing process. If the person deviates from the repeating behavior and so defines a different hierarchy, the others react against that deviation and shape the behavior back into the habitual pattern.[34]

Thus the system maintains itself. It offers resistance to change beyond a certain range, and maintains preferred patterns as long as possible. Alternative patterns are available within the system. But any deviation that goes beyond the system's threshold of tolerance elicits mechanisms which re-establish the accustomed range. When situations of system disequilibrium arise, it is common for family members to feel that other members are not fulfilling their obligations. Calls for family loyalty and guilt-inducing maneuvers then appear.[35]

The normal family is a sequence of interaction between persons

which defines the nature of their relationships with one another. Through

the patterns of interaction the tasks of nurture and socialization of its

members takes place.

In summary, the conceptual scheme of a normal family has three facets. First, a family is transformed over time, adapting and restructuring itself so as to continue functioning. A family that has been functioning effectively may nevertheless respond to developmental stresses by adhering inappropriately to previous structural schemas.

Second, the family has a structure, which can be seen only in movement. Certain patterns are preferred, which suffice in response to ordinary demands. But the strength of the system depends on its ability to mobilize alternative transactional patterns when internal or external conditions of the family demand its restructuring. The boundaries of the subsystems must be firm, yet flexible enough to allow realignment when circumstances change.

Finally, a family adapts to stress in a way that maintains family continuity while making re-structuring possible. If a family responds to stress with rigidity, dysfunctional patterns occur. These may eventually bring the family into therapy.[36]

Given this definition of the normal family, what is the dysfunction

within families that brings them into therapy? "It is the rigid,

---

[34]Ibid., p. 123-124.

[35]Minuchin, _Families and Family Therapy_, p. 52.

[36]Ibid., pp. 65-66.

repetitive sequence of a narrow range that defines pathology."[37] A family

develops trouble when its sequence of patterned interaction is too narrow

to meet the developmental needs of its members and the changing

circumstances of larger social structures.

> The family, as an open sociocultural system, is continually
> faced by demands for change. These demands are sparked by biopsycho-
> social changes in one or more of its members and by various inputs
> from the social system in which every family is imbedded. A
> dysfunctional family is a system that has responded to these internal
> or external demands for change by stereotyping its functioning.
> The accustomed transactional patterns have been preserved to the point
> of rigidity, which blocks any possibilities of alternatives.[38]

Such problems in the interactional patterns of a family are not directly

observable, but show themselves in individual distress. If the problem is

severe enough in the family system, an individual will develop symptoms

of some kind. A symptom is any behavior which the person or the family

identifies as a major problem.

> What usually brings a family into therapy is the symptoms of one
> member of the family. He is the identified patient, whom the family
> labels as "having problems" or "being a problem." But when a
> family labels one of its members "the patient," the identified
> patient's symptoms can be assumed to be a system-maintaining or
> a system-maintained device. The symptom may be an expression of a
> family dysfunction. Or it may have arisen in the individual family
> member because of his particular life circumstances and then been
> supported by the family system. In either case, the family's
> consensus that one member is the problem indicates that at some
> level the symptom is being reinforced by the system.[39]

The sequence of interaction that causes symptoms in individuals is the

sequence that violates the generic rules of hierarchy over a significant

period of time.

---

[37]Haley, _Problem_, p. 105.

[38]Minuchin, _Families and Family Therapy_, p. 110.

[39]Ibid.

If there if a fundamental rule of social organization, it is
that an organization is in trouble when coalitions occur across
levels of a hierarchy, particularly when these coalitions are
secret. . . . But when sequences of this kind become organized so
that they repeat and repeat, the organization is in trouble and
the participants will experience subjective distress.[40]

The definition of dysfunction in a family is a rigid sequence of

behavior which violates the rules of hierarchy and results in symptoms in

an individual member. Distress in an individual who becomes an identi-

fied patient indicates that a sequence of behavior in the family is rigid

and narrow, and that the hierarchy is confused. These problems in the

structure of the family prevent the family from effectively performing

its tasks of nurturing and socializing its members. In some cases,

such families turn to a professional for help.

The role of the family therapist is to relieve the distress in

the individual family members by changing the sequence and hierarchy in

the family. This process involves three simultaneous steps: joining,

diagnosis, and restructuring. These steps are accomplished as the

therapist intervenes in the system through his/her own interaction as a

member of that system.

The family therapist's function is to help the identified
patient and the family by facilitating the transformation of the
family system. This process includes three major steps. The
therapist joins the family in a position of leadership. He unearths
and evaluates the underlying family structure. And he creates
circumstances that will allow the transformation of this structure.
In actual therapy these steps are inseparable.[41]

The first and primary idea is that change occurs by the therapist
joining the ongoing system and changing it by the ways he participates
within it. When dealing with a governed, homeostatic system that is

---

[40]Haley, Problem, p. 104.

[41]Minuchin, Families and Family Therapy, pp. 110-111.

maintained by repeating sequences of behavior, the therapist changes those sequences by shifting the ways people respond to each other because of the ways they must respond to the therapist.[42]

The goal of therapy is to join the family and change the sequence and the hierarchy of the interaction. According to this definition, therapy is intervention. The therapist becomes a part of the family, decides what the patterns of interaction are and what changes need to be made, and then uses his/her interaction with the family to restructure their relationships. Therapy as intervention stands in contrast to therapy which depends on insight or expression of feelings for change, and it rejects the view that relearning is the basic form of change. Rather, individual behavior occurs as a part of the ongoing sequence of family interaction, and individual experience will change as the sequences become more flexible and the hierarchy becomes clarified and appropriate.

First, the therapist must join the family system. Joining operations are techniques of being sensitive to the family pattern of interaction so that the therapist is accepted as a member of the system. "To join a family system, the therapist must accept the family's organization and style and blend with them. He must experience the family's transactional patterns and the strength of those patterns.[43] Joining means communicating sensitivity to the family so they will accept the therapist's leadership in the family. Joining is more than becoming a part of the family, but becoming a part of the family in such a way that they also accept the therapist's higher level of authority in the system.

---

[42]Haley, Problem, p. 119.

[43]Minuchin, Families and Family Therapy, p. 123.

It is the task of the therpaist to change the sequence and so change the hierarchy of the family. It is also his task not to be caught up in a sequence in such a way that he is perpetuating the problem he is supposed to resolve.[44]

Joining involves becoming a part of the family with the power to effect changes, and with clear goals for doing such changing.

Second, the therapist must make a diagnosis of the idiosyncratic pattern of interaction that characterizes a particular family. "In family therapy a diagnosis is the working hypothesis that the therapist evolves from his experiences and observations upon joining the family."[45] Since the interaction patterns are not clearly visible, and are not a part of the awareness of family members, the family structure must be deduced from observing the interaction.

> Diagnosis in family therapy is achieved through the inter-actional process of joining. Family structure, the degree of flexibility inherent in it, the system's resonance, and the position of the identified patient are all invisible entities, which can be perceived only through the therapist's accommodation to and probing of the system. The diagnosis of the family appears in a family map. But because this map is intimately related to the idiosyncratic characteristics of both the therapist and family being joined, diagnosis also includes the way in which the family responds to the therapist.[46]

This last point is important because the family structure is known only with the therapist as a member. The therapist does not know the inter-action patterns of the family without the therapist. Diagnosis is the description of the family including the therapist as a participant-observer. In order to change the family interaction, the therapist must

---

[44]Haley, Problem, p. 125.

[45]Minuchin, Families and Family Therapy, p. 129.

[46]Ibid., p. 130.

make a diagnosis of their particular interaction patterns, including the ways that the problems serve to maintain these patterns. Testing of hypotheses are accomplished by suggesting alternative interaction patterns and observing the flexibility or resistance to such probes. Eventually a description of the family structure will emerge which can be used as the basis for restructuring efforts.

Third, the therapist is responsible for restructuring the family into new interaction patterns which alleviate the presenting problems and increase the potential range of sequences within a stable and clarified hierarchy. ". . . successful therapy is defined as solving specific problems so that there is more variety and complexity in the life of the individual. . ."[47] Restructuring involves bringing changes in sequence and hierarchy.

> A therapist should be able to think in terms of three steps in a sequence, at least, and three levels of a hierarchy. Once he puts together sequence and hierarchy, he is in a position to devise strategies for bringing about change in a rational rather than merely an intuitive way. His simplest goal is to change a sequence by preventing coalitions across generation lines.[48]

Operating out of a conceptual understanding of the family, and with a family map that is specific to a particular family, the therapist adapts his/her interaction with the family in order to accomplish certain goals. By listening or not listening, by being passive or directive, by lifting up certain parts of the discussion and ignoring others, by forming coalitions with some members of the family, then others, the therapist tries to effectively change the way the family members relate to one another. "Restructuring operations are the therapeutive interventions

---

[47]Haley, Problem, p. 171.   [48]Ibid., p. 108.

that confront and change a family in the attempt to force a therapeutic change."[49]

> There are at least seven categories of restructuring operations: actualizing family transactional patterns, marking boundaries, escalating stress, assigning tasks, utilizing symptoms, manipulating mood, and supporting, educating, or guiding.[50]

The assumption of this form of therapy is that the family has alternative transactional patterns which are not being utilized. With the help of the therapist, these new patterns are discovered and practiced, and then become a part of the experience of the family so that they are maintained by the homeostatic principle. When such change has occurred, the therapist can exit from the family because he/she is no longer needed. The speed with which this can be accomplished depends on the prior rigidity of the family and the seriousness of the presenting symptoms. Clinical experience has shown that many families respond quickly to such methods from a skillful therapist and do not require long-term treatment. Follow-up evaluation shows that the presenting problem remains solved and new symptoms are not likely to develop.

In summary, Haley and Minuchin are family therapists who have designed theory and methods for responding to the needs of families in crisis. They define a normal family as a system made up of patterns of interaction. The main components of these patterns are sequence and hierarchy. Family interaction occurs in repeated sequences which define the structural hierarchy of the family and the status and responsibility of each member. When alternative sequences are available, and when the hierarchy can shift to meet the differing needs of its members, the

---

[49]Minuchin, Families and Family Therapy, p. 138.   [50]Ibid., p. 140.

family functions well and is able to nurture and socialize its members effectively. However, because of demands for change from family members and the social context, dysfunction may develop. This means that their sequences become rigid and narrow and the hierarchy becomes confused. The result is individual distress, often seen as symptoms in an individual member. The goal of therapy is to resolve the presenting problem in such a way that alternative transactional patterns are made available to the family, and each individual can have a sense of belonging and a sense of being separate.[51] Such change is accomplished as the therapist joins the family, develops a diagnosis of the problem, and intervenes in the family by restructuring their interaction. Effective intervention will break the homeostatic deadlock and enable the family to develop a more flexible structure.

The position of this paper leads to two primary critiques of the family therapy of Haley and Minuchin when applied to pastoral counseling.

First, they have failed to maintain the unity of the social and the personal which is the central point of this paper. They have given a profound description of the way that persons are social. They have shown the concrete ways in which relationships are internal to individual experience, and how individual behavior is a part of the ongoing sequence of behavior of social systems. However, they have not given an adequate description of the richness and creativity of individual experience, which is its personal aspect. That aspect of experience which is self-creative in using freedom to bring a unique synthesis of the relationships which are given, and that aspect of experience which is self-transcendent

---

[51] Ibid., p. 47.

in seeking to expand the value of the self, others, and the entire world, is the source of hope for increased value in the future. It is at the very point where the individual is creative that much of the depth of individual experience occurs. The individual is both social and personal. The individual is created out of the richness of the relationships of the past immediate world, and creates the world by its free choice of how to synthesize these relationships into a complex unity. This means that we must treat the individual not only as the member of a social system, but also as a creator of value for the future.

Second, they have failed to take responsibility for the questions of value in the world. Haley and Minuchin have tended to overemphasize the pragmatic criteria of problem-solving. Therapy as intervention designed to bring change is a refreshing wind in comparison to those therapies which place heavy normative values on every individual in therapy by diagnosing pathology and blocked growth for every "patient." Family therapy pushes the therapist to take responsibility for realistic goals and to pursue them with respect for the freedom of individuals to choose their own goals. However, pastoral counseling must be concerned with goals which are broader than effectiveness, namely, the values toward which effectiveness moves. Pastoral counselors are responsible for the context within which their counsel is given and its effect on the total life of the individual and societies. Pastoral counselors are called also to be prophetic about the normative values of the cultural context within which persons live and within which therapy occurs. This leads to a much broader responsibility than the family therapists have assumed.

A model for pastoral counseling. This section is a brief description of a model of pastoral counseling based on the anthropology of this paper and on the structural family therapy of Haley and Minuchin.

Normal human experience is a process of interaction which has a social and a personal aspect. The social aspect of experience is the way in which the individual is an internal part of the ongoing sequence of becoming of the world. The personal aspect of experience is the way in which the individual makes a unique contribution to the world process. The world is one process of which the individual is a unit, and to which the individual makes a contribution.

The process that makes up the life of the individual can be identified at four levels. At the intrapsychic level, the individual is the accumulated and remembered series of occasions which make a particular hisotir route of occasions. A person has a unique relationship with this series of events which it has to no other series. One of the primary characteristics of this relationship is memory. The person remebers the history of interaction and lives out of this memory in terms of pre- ferred patterns of interaction with others. At the level of primary relationships, the individual is involved in long-term and intense relationships with specific others. These significant others have a major impact on the emotional life of the individual. At the level of larger social structures, the individual is a product of many complex and contrasting relationships. Persons are significantly shaped by participation in a place of employment, social and religious groups, service and political affiliations, national identity, and many others.

Finally, individual experience is shaped by the totality of the universe, especially in terms of one's relationship to God, who represents the perspective of the whole. God is the most universal and the most intimate one who interacts with the individual and helps to shape experience.

In normal, healthy human life, the individual is able to make sense out of the contrasting feelings received from all these levels of relationship, and is able to be creative to obtain some measure of satisfaction and meaning for the self. However, difficulties can and do develop at all levels of the ongoing world process, and this results in problems with many different descriptions. Often the source of the problems is not clear, but is felt by the individual as subjective distress.

According to this model, dysfunction is defined as a "rigid, repetitive sequence of a narrow range."[52] This means that the patterns of interaction which characterize the flow of life and which carry its meaning are stuck in a range so that sensitivity and creativity cannot be increased. In response to contradictory feelings which are not resolved, the individual and/or group adapts a pattern of interaction which does not allow the full reception of the feelings of others or the response with the full range of new feelings.

Whenever persons are involved in a sequence of interaction which blocks increased sensitivity and creativity, there will be individual distress and the development of symptoms at some level of the social system. The dysfunction may exist at the level of the intrapsychic, primary relationships, larger social structures, or God, or any combination of these levels. For example, at the intrapsychic level,

---

[52] Haley, Problem, p. 105.

a young adult who has left home, but has not formed satisfactory intimate relationships with peers, may become withdrawn and suicidal. In response to a breakdown in supportive relationships, the individual may block out awareness of the larger world, and may be unable to find creative alternatives to the present isolation. At the level of primary relationships, a family may become stuck in a pattern of interaction which does not allow successful coping with the changing needs of its members. A young adult may be unable to leave home without getting sick because the family is unable to adjust to his/her absence. Sensitivity to the changing needs of the family members is blocked, and the creativity needed to find more flexible sequences is also blocked. At the level of larger social structures, institutions of education or employment may not function well because of a breakdown at some level of the system. The quality of teaching and the morale of the students may be low because the principal does not have the skill to shape the faculty into a working team. Massive displacement of families may occur through unemployment because of shifts in the world economy. Finally, an entire society may begin to dysfunction during a time of revolution or defeat in war so that basic changes must take place in a population's understanding of God. The defeat of Israel by Babylon caused the prophets to provide a different understanding of God's relationship to persons. The holocaust in Germany called into question basic understandings of God in that nation.

Dysfunction which shows up as individual distress is defined here as a problem in the process of interaction which makes up all experience. When sequences are rigid, sensitivity and creativity are blocked, and the essential drive toward love is perverted. Such dysfunction

may be minor or severe, but will reveal itself in individual pain and distress.

This model accepts the definition of therapy as intervention. The goal of pastoral counseling is intervention into the social systems of persons in order to increase sensitivity and creativity. When persons come to a pastor or any professional for help, they are implicitly saying that their life process is unsatisfactory for some reason and they have come to get outside help. The role of the pastor is to interact with a person or a social system so that the sequence is made more flexible and the potential for increased sensitivity and creativity is enlarged.

The first part of intervention is joining. Joining is the process of establishing a trusting relationship with the persons and/or groups involved in the counseling. This is accomplished through sensitivity to the feelings and interactions of the individuals/groups so that rapport is developed.

After some level of trust has been established, the pastor must decide which level of the social system is the most effective one to diagnose and plan for intervention. The level which is most available is the intrapsychic level because at least one person has to bring a problem before counseling can begin. The level of primary relationships is next in terms of accessibility. Other levels are increasingly difficult to join and to design interventions which are effective. It is important to note at this point that any decision to focus on one level to the exclusion of others may be an arbitrary decision for the purposes of intervention and may not accurately reflect the situation of an individual. In order to fairly describe a problem it is often necessary

to refer to all four levels of the social systems in which he/she is involved.

After the pastor has developed rapport with the persons/groups available for counseling, and has made a decision about which level on which to focus, a diagnosis of that social system must be made. Assuming that sensitivity and creativity are blocked by a rigid sequence of interaction, the pastor must develop a hypothesis about the interaction patterns which are creating the presenting problems. Here a map of exact sequences of interaction and the structures and hierarchies they define can be developed.

Based on the diagnosis, the pastor's job is to develop a series of interventions which will increase the available transactional patterns. In terms of the model being developed here, the goal is to intervene so that the persons/groups can develop increased sensitivity and creativity.

So far this model of pastoral counseling is similar to the one developed by Haley and Minuchin. Given the research of this paper, what is the uniqueness of pastoral counseling? What does this research contribute to the therapeutic model of structural family therapy? There are three ways in which this model is unique.

1. This model of pastoral counseling preserves the unity of the social and personal aspects of human experience. In the history of psychotherapy this has been a most difficult problem. In the various schools, emphasis has tended to be either social, showing how individual experience is totally determined by the social context, or personal, showing how individual experience is totally determined by intrapsychic events. Even in the work of Haley and Minuchin, there is a tendency to focus on

the individual as determined by the family and other social systems, and to minimize the freedom of the individual to determine the context.

This model is most adequate for showing how individual experience is determined by the social context, and how the individual has freedom to choose between various alternatives and exercise self-determination. Others are internal to the experience of the individual in that they provide the causative forces which create the individual. The individual is free to the extent that it can decide how to integrate these social forces in a unique way which will shape the future.

The unity of the social and personal means that pastoral counseling can be done with individuals and groups at many different levels without changing basic assumptions about the nature of human life and the world. Individuals are social and personal whatever the particular context of their activity. Human nature is social and personal, whether an individual is struggling with a persistent personal problem, or adjusting to changes in the family, or responding to social interaction in the community, the nation, or the world. Individuals are a reflection of their relationships with others, and they are creative in shaping these relationships for various goals. The gap between the social and personal has been essentially overcome in this model, and one need not shift models to account for different phenomena.

One of the advantages of this model of pastoral counseling is that it can account for and respond to a larger amount of data. Therapies which focus on the intrapsychic tend to exclude the social data, while behaviorism excludes the intrapsychic material. This model can take into account all the data from intrapsychic phenomena which is accessible only to the individual to the influence of the larger social structures.

2. In this model of pastoral counseling, the goal toward which counseling is directed is love. Love is defined as increasing sensitivity and creativity which moves toward communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. We need to move now toward a definition of love which is applicable to the clinical situation. How does a therapist recognize love when it is present in the conversations of therapy? What are the signs that the blocks to sensitivity and creativity are being removed so that love can increase? If love is the goal of pastoral counseling, how can one discover whether this goal is being reached?

These questions cannot be answered fully here. The following discussion will point in some of the directions these questions lead. It is clear from the bias of this paper that the goal of love must be identified in the concrete interaction of life if it is to have meaning.

"Research investigators require complex theories; clinicians need simple ones."[53] This statement means that researchers have the time to look carefully at their data and they need theories which will account for the endless variations that are possible. During a clinical experience, a therapist must be able to survey the data quickly and develop hypotheses in order to act effectively. Persons in crisis need effective responses, not detailed analysis. Therefore a helpful theory of therapy must reduce the many variables to the most important ones for evaluating the process of interaction and designing ways of bringing about change.

---

[53]Ibid., p. 100.

The goal of therapy is the increase of love which is defined as the increase of sensitivity and creativity. We have defined loving sensitivity as "the extent to which an individual or a group can receive into awareness all the conflicting data received in a moment of experience." This definition includes several assumptions about human interaction. It assumes that all interaction includes and excludes various data. Whatever happens at any level tends to value up certain data and value down other data. In this context, data refer to physical feelings, gestures, behavior, all the forms of communicaton which pass between individuals. This definition assumes that the more sensitive (loving) group or individual can include more data into awareness. Smaller individuals must exclude data which cannot be harmonized into order to maintain integrity. Larger individuals can include more data, and this process is inherently more valuable because it increases the unity of the world.

When working with a group or an individual, the primary question to be asked is: What data do the individual or group include and exclude from awareness? The Gestalt psychologists are helpful here with their description of figure and ground. Awareness tends to select a figure as the focus of attention from the ground which includes the total environment. Focus on any figure by definition excludes sharp awareness of the rest of the ground. Sensitivity can be identified by distinguishing between figure and ground in the awareness of a person or a group. Is the selection of the focus of awareness, the figure, inclusive, to the extent that it maintains openness to other parts of the ground? Or does the individual or group deliberately exclude from awareness certain data which are important? One of the principles of

Gestalt therapists is that deliberate focus on a particular figure may be an attempt to suppress other relevant data from awareness. An individual may be obsessed with a certain relationship in order to avoid confronting the pain of another relationship. A group may deliberately exclude the participation of one member as a way of avoiding confrontation with a difficulty in the group process. One way a therapist can judge the quality of interaction for an individual or a group is to notice what data are being included and excluded from awareness. Loving sensitivity moves toward the inclusion of all relevant data into awareness.

We have defined loving creativity as "the extent to which an individual or a group can actualize possibilities that harmonize the contradictions of the past and also maintain a sense of integrity." This definition assumes that the reception of physical feelings into a moment of experience always includes contradictions which have an opposing effect on the individual. Such contradictions can be excluded at the level of sensitivity, but this solution does not move toward greater value in the future. This definition assumes that the more creative (loving) individual or group can actualize larger possibilities and maintain a sense of integrity.

When working with an individual or a group, certain questions can be asked to identify when creativity is becoming more loving. How does the individual or group respond to contradictory data? How does the individual or group work through situations or unresolved contradictions? Two particular responses are counterproductive. An individual or group can practice avoidance which minimizes the contradictions and refuses to face them. This way avoids responsibility for new possibilities. Or an individual or group can maintain the contradictions by staying at the

impasse between them. This is the method of staying stuck and conflicted. Haley and Minuchin identify it as having a rigid sequence of a narrow range. Such narrow interaction maintains the contradictions and the sequence so that creativity is stifled.

One way a therapist can judge the quality of interaction for an individual or a group is to notice whether new possibilities are entertained and explored and actualized in interaction. The more creative group will be more flexible and complex in its ability to imagine novel possibilities, and then bring them into actuality.

In summary, the goal of therapy is the increase of love. Love is the increase of sensitivity and creativity within the process of inter-action. Loving sensitivity moves toward the includsion of more data within a moment of experience without the exclusion of data which is relevant. Loving creativity moves toward the imagination and actualization of novel possibilities which harmonize the contradictions of the past and maintain a sense of integrity. When a rigid sequence of a narrow range becomes more flexible and complex, the process of interaction tends to move toward greater sensitivity and creativity.

3. Pastoral counseling is unique because it deliberately focuses on the interaction of an individual or group with God. This model assumes that God is an interactant in the center of human life, and that consciousness of interaction with God often increases the probability of faithfulness to the will of God. While human sin can bring disobedience to the clear will of God, the probability of obedience is increased when God's interaction is brought into consciousness in the lives of individuals and groups.

The question for pastoral counseling is how to bring awareness of
God into the therapeutic situation. This problem is more complex than
it first appears. A more detailed discussion would involve the following
points. a) God can be identified as a part of concrete experience, such
as love, and God's will discussed as the movement of love in experience.
The presence of God is defined as "that feeling that the world is a unity
and that all becoming is interdependent, and as the awareness of unrealized
possibilities which have the potential to bring enlarged freedom into
actuality." According to this definition, God will tend to become
identified with the feeling of unity with others, and with the enriched
imagination of those possibilities which are valuable for self and world.
This has potential for speaking concretely about God as love. b) God
could be identified as the idea which represents the highest value in
the life of an individual or a gorup. Here God is that which is ultimate
and to which persons owe their allegiance. This would open the discussion
of values and meanings for individuals and groups. c) A more traditional
approach is the discussion of God in terms of religious experiences and
intuitions. Because of the tradition of religion, most people relate
God with discussion of church, theology, ethics, prayer, and mystical
experiences. For many persons, the thoughts and experiences about God in
this context are confusing and contradictory. God is felt alternately as
a judge and as a paternalistic benefactor. Sorting out these ideas and
feelings can be a source of therapeutic growth for an individual or a
group and can be healing in the midst of crisis.

According to this model of pastoral counseling, the basic question
is how to discover the will of God and become faithful to it. God is the
one who presents the possibilities of greatest value within each moment

of experience. Discovery and obedience to the will of God is the best that an individual or group can do for the satisfaction of self and the world. However this process is always complex and difficult. The will of God is usually not clear and precise, and is often confused with the projections of human sin. The church has never found a shortcut to the full use of experience within a corporate setting. Sources of authority for the will of God include Scriptures, church history, rational theology, prayer and meditation, and the will of the community. Any combination of these does not insure full knowledge of the will of God, and whole societies have found themselves opposing God even when there was a clear consensus. There is no substitute for the careful and disciplined search for the will of God in an attitude of humility and confession of sin. There is no shortcut for the risk of obedience in the knowledge that one may be wrong. A maturing faith will be able to struggle with all these variables, to reach concrete decisions about God's will in a particular moment, and to actualize the chosen possibilities in spite of the risk of error.

Pastoral counselors are therapists who are willing to work intimately with individuals and groups in their search for knowledge of and obedience to the will of God. There is no other method than an open search through the process of interaction. Pastoral counselors must proceed on the faith that God reveals God's will when the levels of sensitivity and commitment have made such revelation possible.

Research Potential

This brief section will outline beginning thoughts about a research project based on the theoretical material in this paper. Human nature is

described as essentially social and personal and is defined in terms of sensitivity and creativity. What is valuable in human experience is called love and is defined as increased sensitivity and creativity. Research from this position would involve measuring sensitivity and creativity as a way of evaluating the size of an individual or a gorup, and discovering ways to increase these constructs in interaction.

One possible research project would involve measuring the quality of interaction in a specific time-limited group interaction. Any group could be the subject of this research, but certain groups would be particularly relevant for pastoral counseling: families, extended families, support and growth groups, retreat experiences, task groups such as church boards and committees. Any group that has a history and a future together could be a good subject for this research.

The goal would be to measure the size of the group during a specific sequence of interaction. The key constructs would be as follows: SIZE: the extent to which a group or an individual exhibits loving sensitivity and loving creativity in the process of interaction. LOVING SENSITIVITY: the extent to which an individual or a group can receive into awareness all the conflicting data received in a moment of experience. LOVING CREATIVITY: the extent to which an individual or a group can actualize possibilities that harmonize the contradictions of the past and also maintain a sense of integrity.

There are three methods by which these constructs could be measured in group interaction. a) self-rating--provide a questionnaire for members to rate the quality of interaction after it had taken place. b) rating by direct observers--provide criteria for observations and comments by persons during live observation of group interaction.

c) rating from video tape--provide criteria for observation and comments by persons during play-back of video tape.

The instruments for evaluation of the group process would include certain questions such as the following written for the self-rating method. Rating by observation would include an increased emphasis on non-verbal communication and the larger social context.

On the sensitivity scale, questions such as the following would be asked: a) At what points did you feel _most_ included in the group process? b) At what points did you feel _least_ included in the group process? c) Did you observe that some group members were included more often than others? When? d) What specific comments or gestures made you feel included or excluded in the group process? e) Which of your specific comments contributed most to the feeling of unity in the group? Which contributed least?

On the creativity scale, questions such as the following would be asked: a) How well did the group accomplish its task? b) What was the underlying problem facing the group during its interaction? c) Was there hidden agenda that interfered with resolving the identified problem? d) Did you have ideas or solutions which were received or rejected by the group? f) Did the group find the best solution to its problem? g) What parts of the problem did the group avoid? Why?

These questions need to be sharpened and refined in order to insure that they are valid in terms of measuring the constructs. The questions are trying to measure the extent to which the group was open to the feelings and ideas of every member (sensitivity) and the extent to which the group was able to encourage imaginative solutions which helped to resolve the contradictions of the presenting problem (creativity).

A scale would need to be developed which would distinguish the levels of group interaction based on these constructs, and then comparisons made between groups. Hopefully one of the results would be the identification of skills which could be taught to a group to increase their sensitivity and creativity.

A possible hypothesis of this research project could be: There will be a positive correlation between the scores on the Sensitivity Scale and the Creativity Scale. The group and/or individuals that score higher on the Sensitivity Scale will also score higher on the Creativity Scale.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter started with a summary of the problem and the solution of this paper. In the human sciences and pastoral care and counseling an individualistic anthropology has led to a bifurcation of the social and personal in human life. This is seen most clearly in the doctrine of love where there is a gap between self-love and love of others which God must bridge. Such a division has meant that the social aspects of existence have been minimized in pastoral care and counseling and the individual abstracted from the context in which it has its being. The solution to this problem is a process anthropology which is social and personal in its essential nature. The individual emerges from the relationships which are given by the past actual world, thus others are internal to the experience of the individual. The freedom of the individual consists in its decision of how to synthesize these many relationships into one feeling for the future. This anthropology leads to a different conceptualization of love. When human life is conceived as essentially social and personal, then love is a way of speaking about value for the

individual and the world. An act is loving which leads to communion and enlarged freedom for self, others, and God. The division between self-love and love of others is essentially overcome because interaction affects the self, others, and God at the same time. Love is the essential drive of the universe toward increased value. The division between self and others is reintroduced as a problem in existence through sin. Sin is the perversion of love, that is, the decision to sacrifice communion and enlarged freedom for the sake of short-term goals and pleasures. While this division is not an essential one, it is actual in the world and must be overcome through the patient and faithful action of God. God's love has been revealed most fully in Jesus Christ and is active in the experience of individuals to overcome the reality of sin and make love actual in human experience. Seeking the specific will of God in the life of an individual is a way to heighten the work of love in human life.

This final chapter has drawn out some of the implications of this study for the field of pastoral care and counseling. Pastoral counseling is the ministry of the Christian church which uses the resources of theology and the human sciences to respond to the personal crises of individuals within the social context of which they are a part. Pastoral care is the ministry of the church which includes pastoral counseling, and also includes the socialization of persons into the belief and life-style of the church community. Pastoral care is the larger category and many of the implications apply at both levels.

The context of pastoral care is an issue because the individualistic assumptions of the field have tended to ignore or minimize the larger context of work with individuals. Critiques from various places have pointed out that pastoral care has not sufficiently taken into account the

way in which individuals are the product of social systems at many levels. Since human experience is social and personal, every person is a perspective on the world, and every person is unique and free. This means that the context is a part of the experience of individuals and must be taken into account on at least four levels. Every person is an intrapsychic system with causal efficacy from past experiences which help to determine the present and the future. Every person is a product of the system of primary relationships which determines behavior and subjective feelings. Every person is a result of the interplay of larger social systems in the world which determine social, economic, political, and moral views on life. Every person is an interactant with God who is both the largest perspective on the world and a most intimate cause in the life of the person. In order for pastoral care to be most helpful in its work with individuals, the context at these four levels must be taken into account. This means taking seriously the extent to which the individual is a product of the social systems at all four levels, and the way in which the indivdiual is responsible for the social context through the exercise of freedom.

A central issue in pastoral care is its relation to theology. Three questions help frame this issue: How does theology inform pastoral care? How are theology and the human sciences related? How does pastoral care inform theology? First, the doctrine of God was reviewed. God is an active participant in the becoming of each occasion and can be identified in three ways: God as concrete; God as the drive toward unity in the world; God as the drive toward increased value in the world. Since God is active for each occasion, part of the goal of pastoral care

is the identification of the specific will of God for the individual. The methods for seeking God's will involve being attentive to the social and personal aspects of experience within the context of the corporate search for God's will.

Second, the model for empirical theology provides a mechanism for informing ministry from theology and the human sciences and then allowing the events of ministry to inform theology and the human sciences. Empirical theology requires starting from the concrete events of ministry, soaring in the free imagination with the use of the resources of theology and the human sciences, and then returning to the concrete situation to test one's generalizations against their applicability and adequacy. This method describes a process which can occur during a counseling interaction, or can describe a method of training and research.

Finally, pastoral counseling is the response to persons in crises. The method here was to develop operational definitions of the key constructs from this research paper, to draw on the clinical methods from structural family therapy, the then to develop a model of doing therapy and research from these definitions.

In conclusion, this paper defined a problem in anthropology in pastoral care and counseling, suggested a view of human nature which is social and personal and which leads to a new view of love, and then drew out the implications for pastoral care and counseling. More work needs to be done.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Verne Paul. "The Theological Significance of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971.

Alves, Ruben. "Personal Wholeness and Political Creativity: The Theology of Liberation and Pastoral Care." Pastoral Psychology, 26 (Winter 1977), 124-136.

Bateson, Gregory. "The Cybernetics of Self: A Theory of Alcoholism." Psychiatry, 34 (1971), 1-18.

Bateson, Gregory. Steps to an Ecology of Mind. New York: Ballantine Books, 1972.

Bateson, Gregory, Don D. Jackson, Jay Haley, and John H. Weakland. "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia." Behavior Science, 1 (1956), 251-264.

Berger, Milton (ed.) Beyond the Double Bind. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1978.

Berger, Peter L. Sacred Canopy. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.

Berger Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.

Bertalanffy, Ludwig von. General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. New York: Braziller, 1968.

Blackburn, Charles William. "The Theology of Daniel Day Williams." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Southern Baptist Seminary, 1975.

Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Boisen, Anton. The Exploration of the Inner World. New York: Harper, 1936.

Boisen, Anton. Out of the Depths. New York: Harper, 1960.

Boisen, Anton. Problems in Religion and Life. New York: Abingdon, 1946.

Boisen, Anton. Religion in Crisis and Custom. Westport, CT: Greenwood, c. 1955, 1977.

Brockman, John (ed.) About Bateson. New York: Dutton, 1977.

Browning, Don S. "Analogy, Symbol and Pastoral Theology in Tillich's Thought." Pastoral Psychology, 19 (February 1958), 41-54.

Browning, Don S. Atonement and Psychotherapy. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Browning, Don S. Generative Man. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973.

Browning, Don S. The Moral Context of Pastoral Care. Philadelphia:
Westminster, 1966.

Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs:
Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Cabot, Robert C., and Russell Dicks. The Art of Ministering to the Sick.
New York: Macmillan, 1936.

Chesler, Phyllis. Women and Madness. New York: Avon Books, 1972.

Clebsch, William A., and Charles R. Jaekle. Pastoral Care in Historical
Perspective. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling. Nashville:
Abingdon, 1966.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Community Mental Health: The Role of Church
and Temple. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Growth Counseling for Marriage Enrichment.
Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Mental Health Through Christian Community.
New York: Abingdon, 1965.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. The People Dynamic. New York: Harper, 1972.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr., and Harvey Seifert. Personal Growth and
Social Change. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic.
Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Cobb, John B., Jr. Christ in a Pluralistic Age. Philadelphia:
Westminster, 1975.

Cobb, John B., Jr. A Christian Natural Theology. Philadelphia:
Westminster, 1975.

Cobb, John B., Jr., and David Ray Griffin. Process Theology: An
Introductory Exposition. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

Cobb, John B., Jr. "Strengthening the Spirit." Union Seminary
Quarterly Review, 30 (Winter-Summer 1975), 130-139.

Cobb, John B., Jr. Theology and Pastoral Care. Philadelphia:
Fortress, 1977.

Connor, Walter. "A Covenant Model of Marriage for Use in Pastoral Care."
Unpublished PhD dissertation, Boston University, 1966.

Coser, Lewis A. Masters of Sociological Thought. New York: Harcourt, 1971.

Daly, Mary. Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation. Boston: Beacon, 1973.

Dicks, Russell. Pastoral Work and Personal Counseling. New York: Macmillan, 1947.

Dicks, Russell. Principles and Practices of Pastoral Counseling. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Dicks, Russell. Toward Health and Wholeness. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Doniger, Simon (ed.) The Nature of Man in Theological and Psychological Perspective. New York: Harper, 1962.

Erickson, Gerald D., and Terrence P. Hogan, (eds.) Family Therapy: An Introduction to Theory and Technique. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole, 1972.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society, 2d ed. New York: Norton, 1963.

Erikson, Erik H. Gandhi's Truth. New York: Norton, 1969.

Erikson, Erik H. "Identity and the Life Cycle." Psychological Issues 1, No. 1 (1959), 18-171.

Erikson, Erik H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.

Erikson, Erik H. Insight and Responsibility. New York: Norton, 1964.

Erikson, Erik H. Young Man Luther. New York: Norton, 1958.

Ferber, Andrew, Marilyn Mendelson, and Augustus Napier,(eds.) The Book of Family Therapy. New York: Science House, 1972.

Foley, Vincent. "Conceptual Roots of Conjoint Family Therapy: A Comparative Analysis of Major Theories." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Boston University, 1971.

Freemand, Eugene, and William L. Reese (eds.) Process and Divinity. LaSalle: Open Court, 1964.

Friere, Paulo. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury, 1973.

Friere, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury, 1970.

Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.

Goffman, Erving. Interaction Ritual. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.

Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Doubleday, 1959.

Goslin, David A. (ed.) Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Guerin, Philip J. (ed.) Family Therapy: Theory and Practice. New York: Gardner, 1976.

Haley, Jay. The Power Tactics of Jesus Christ and Other Essays. New York: Avon Books, 1969.

Haley, Jay. Problem-Solving Therapy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Haley, Jay. Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963.

Haley, Jay, and Lynn Hoffman. Techniques of Family Therapy. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Haley, Jay. Uncommon Therpy: The Psychiatric Techniques of Milton Erickson, M.D. New York: Ballantine, 1973.

Hiltner, Seward. The Christian Shepherd: Some Aspects of Pastoral Care. New York: Abingdon, 1959.

Hiltner, Seward. The Context of Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abingdon, 1961.

Hiltner, Seward. Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abingdon, 1949.

Hiltner, Seward. Preface to Pastoral Theology. New York: Abingdon, 1958.

Hiltner, Seward. Religion and Health. New York: Macmillan, 1943.

Hiltner, Seward. Theological Dynamics. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.

Hulme, William E. Counseling and Theology. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1956.

Hulme, William E. Pastoral Care Come of Age. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.

Hulme, William E. The Pastoral Care of Families: Its Theory and Practice. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

Jackson, Don D. (ed.) Communication, Family, and Marriage. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1968.

Jackson, Don D. (ed.) The Etiology of Schizophrenia. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Jackson, Don D. (ed.) Therapy, Communication and Change. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1968.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Mentor, c. 1902, 1958.

Johnson, Paul E. "Brightman's Contribution to Personalism." Personalist, 35 (1954), 59-72.

Johnson, Paul E. Christian Love. New York: Abingdon, 1951.

Johnson, Paul E. "The Inductive Approach to God." Journal of Philosophy, 38 (1941), 373-381.

Johnson, Paul E. "Interpersonal Psychology of Religion--Moreno and Buber." Group Psychotherapy, 12 (1959), 211-217.

Johnson, Paul E. "Is Loyalty Enough?" Personalist, 25 (1944), 144-153.

Johnson, Paul E. Person and Counselor. Nashville: Abingdon, 1967.

Johnson, Paul E., and Lowell G. Colston. Personality and Christian Faith. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.

Johnson, Paul E. Personality and Religion. Nashville: Abingdon, 1957.

Johnson, Paul E. "Psychology and Values." Personalist, 40 (1959), 272-279.

Johnson, Paul E. Psychology of Pastoral Care. New York: Abingdon, 1953.

Johnson, Paul E. Psychology of Religion. New York: Abingdon, 1945.

Johnson, Paul E. Psychology of Religion, rev. and enl. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1959.

Johnson, Paul E. "Theology of Interpersonalism." Sociometry, 12 (1949), 225-234.

Johnson, Paul E. "Theology of Pastoral Care." Journal of Religion and Health, 3 (1964), 171-175.

Jordan, James A., Jr. "The Concept of Self and Value from Whitehead and its Implications for Education." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Emory University, 1955.

Kemp, Charles F. Physicians of the Soul. New York: Macmillan, 1947.

Krasner, Barbara R. "Sublime Anthropomorphism: The Significance of Jewish Mysticism for Personal and Communal Existence." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Temple University, 1975.

Lawrence, J.S. "A.N. Whitehead's Panpsychical Theory of the Individual Existent." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, 1964.

Lee, R.T. "Whitehead's Theory of Self." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1962.

Limper, Peter F. "Value and the Individual in the Philosophies of Whitehead and Pierce." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Yale University 1975.

Lindesmith, Alfred R., Anselm Strauss, and Norman K. Denzin. Readings in Social Psychology. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden, 1975.

Lindesmith, Alfred R., and Anselm Strauss. Social Psychology. 3d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Loomer, Bernard M. "Dimensions of Freedom," in Bernard Lee and Harry J. Cargas (eds). Religious Experience and Process Theology. New York: Paulist, 1976, 323-339.

Loomer, Bernard M. "Ely on Whitehead's God," in Delwin Brown, Gene Reeves, and Ralph E. James (eds.) Process Philosophy and Christian Thought. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971, 162-179.

Loomer, Bernard M. "Empirical Theology Within Process Thought," in Bernard E. Meland (ed.) The Future of Empirical Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969, 149-173.

Loomer, Bernard M. "Faith and Process Philosophy." Journal of Religion, 29 (1949), 181-203.

Loomer, Bernard M. "The Free and Relational Self," in W. W. Schroder and Gibson Winter (eds.) Belief and Ethics. Chicago: Center for Scientific Study of Religion, 1978, 69-86.

Loomer, Bernard M. "The Size of God," 1978. (Mimeographed.)

Loomer, Bernard M. "Two Kinds of Power." Criterion, 15, No. 1 (1976) 12-29.

Malony, H. Newton, Current Perspectives in the Psychology of Religion. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

"Man in Community," Special Issue, Pastoral Psychology, 15 (June 1964).

"Man in Community," Special Issue, Pastoral Psychology, 18 (March 1967).

Manis, Jerome G., and Bernard N. Meltzer (eds.) Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology. Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1967.

McNeill, John T. A History of the Cure of Souls. New York: Harper, 1951.

Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self, and Society. ed. Charles W. Morris, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1934, 1962.

Mead, George Herbert. Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Mead, George Herbert. On Social Psychology. ed. Anselm Strauss, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1934, 1964.

Mead, George Herbert. The Philosophy of the Act. ed. Charles W. Morris, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Meland, Bernard E. (ed.) The Future of Empirical Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Memmi, Albert. The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon, 1967.

Mickey, Paul Albert. "Toward a Theology of Individuality: A Theological Inquiry Based on the Work of Alfred North Whitehead and David Rapaport." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970.

Minuchin, Salvador, and others. "A Conceptual Model of Psychosomatic Illness in Children." Archives of General Psychiatry, 32 (August 1975), 1031-1038.

Minuchin, Salvador. "Conflict-Resolution Family Therapy." Psychiatry, 28 (1965), 278-286.

Minuchin, Salvador. Families and Family Therapy. Cambridge: Harvard, 1974.

Minuchin, Salvador, and others. Families of the Slums. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Minuchin, Salvador. "Family Therapy: Technique or Theory," in Jules H. Masserman (ed.) Science and Psychoanalysis. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1969.

Minuchin, Salvador, Ronald Liebman, and Lester Baker. "An Integrated Treatment Program for Anoerxia Nervosa." American Journal of Psychiatry, 131 (April 1974), 432-436.

Minuchin, Slavador, and others. "A Project to Teach Learning Skills to Disturbed Delinquent Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 37 (1967), 558-567.

Minuchin, Salvador. "Structural Family Therapy," in Gerald Caplan (ed.) American Handbook of Psychiatry, III, rev. ed. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Minuchin, Salvador, and Braulio Montalvo. "Techniques for Working with Disorganized Low Socioeconomic Families," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 37 (October 1967), 880-887.

Minuchin, Salvador, and Avner Barcai. "Therapeutically Induced Family Crisis," in Jules H. Musserman (ed.) Science and Psychoanalysis. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1969.

Minuchin, Salvador. "The Use of an Ecological Framework in Child Psychiatry," in James E. Anthony and Cyrille Koupernik (eds.) XIV, The Child in his Family. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Minuchin, Salvador, Ronald Liebman, and Lester Baker, "The Use of Structural Family Therapy in the Treatment of Intractable Asthma," American Journal of Psychiatry, 131 (May 1974), 535-540.

Moutakes, Clark E. (ed.) The Self: Explorations in Personal Growth. New York: Harper, 1956.

Oates, Wayne E. Anxiety in Christian Perspective. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1955.

Oates, Wayne E. Christ and Selfhood. New York: Association, 1961.

Oates, Wayne E. (ed.) An Introduction to Pastoral Care. Nashville: Broadman, 1959.

Oates, Wayne. E. New Dimensions in Pastoral Care. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.

Oates, Wayne E. Pastoral Counseling. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Oates, Wayne E. Pastoral Counseling in Social Problems. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Oates, Wayne E. Protestant Pastoral Counseling. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.

Oates, Wayne E. The Religious Dimensions of Personality. New York: Association, 1957.

Oates, Wayne E. Religious Factors in Mental Illness. New York: Association, 1955.

Oden, Thomas C. Contemporary Theology and Psychotherapy. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.

Oden, Thomas C. Kerygma and Counseling. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Oden, Thomas C. The Structure of Awareness. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.

Oglesby, William B., Jr. (ed.) The New Shape of Pastoral Theology. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.

Outler, Albert C. Psychotherapy and the Christian Message. New York: Harper, 1954.

Parsons, Talcott, and Robert F. Bales. Family Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1951.

Patterson, Gerald R. Families: Applications of Social Learning to Life. Champaign, IL: Research Press, 1971.

Patton, John. "A Theory of Interpersonal Ministry Based on the Systematic Theology of Paul Tillich and the Psychological Theory of Harry Stack Sullivan." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967.

Peel, David R. "Juan Luis Segundo's, 'A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity': A Latin American Contribution to Contemporary Theological Understanding." Perkin's Journal, 30, No. 3 (Spring 1977), 1-9.

Pruyser, Paul W. A Dynamic Psychology of Religion. New York: Harper, 1976.

Quayle, William A. The Pastor-Preacher. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1910.

Riskin, Jules, and Elaine E. Faunce. "An Evaluative Review of Family Interaction Research." Family Process, 11 (1972), 365-455.

Roberts, David E. Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man. New York: Scribner, 1950.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Concept of the Fully Functioning Person." Pastoral Psychology, 16 (April 1965), 21-34.

Rogers, Carl R. "Learning to be Free." Pastoral Psychology, 13, Parts 1 and 2 (November-December 1962), 47-54, 43-51.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Nature of Man." Pastoral Psychology, 11 (May 1960), 23-26.

Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Ruesch, Jurgen, and Gregory Bateson. Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1951.

Ruesch, Jurgen. Disturbed Communication: The Clinical Assessment of Normal and Pathological Communicative Behavior. New York: Norton, 1857.

Ruesch, Jurgen. Knowledge in Action: Communication, Social Operations, and Management. New York: Aronson, 1975.

Ruesch, Jurgen, and W. Kees. Nonverbal Communication. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Ruesch, Jurgen. Therapeutic Communication. New York: Norton, 1961.

Ruether, Rosemary (ed.) Religion and Sexism: Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Tradition. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Schroeder, W.W., and Gibson Winter (eds.) Belief and Ethics. Chicago: Center for Scientific Study of Religion, 1978.

Sherrill, Lewis J. Guilt and Redemption. Richmond: Knox, 1945.

Shibutani, Tamotsu (ed.) Human Nature and Collective Behavior: Papers in Honor of Herbert Blumer. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Smith, Ronald A. "A Concept of Community for Christian Ethics: An Inquiry into the Relationship and Functions Characteristic of Authentic Community from the Perspective of the Christian Faith." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Baylor University, 1972.

Stierlin, Helm. Psychoanalysis and Family Therapy. New York: Aronson, 1977.

Sullivan, Harry Stack. The Collected Works of Harry Stack Sullivan, M.D. New York: Norton, 1954.

Szasz, Thomas C. The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conduct. New York: Harper, 1961.

"Theology of Conversion," Special Issue, Pastoral Psychology, 16 (September 1965).

"Theology of Conversion," Special Issue, Pastoral Psychology, 17 (September 1966).

Thornton, Edward E. Professional Education for Ministry: A History of Clinical Pastoral Education. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.

Thornton, Edward E. Theology and Pastoral Counseling. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Tillich, Paul. "Psychoanalysis, Existentialism and Theology." Pastoral Psychology, 9 (October 1958), 9-17.

Tillich, Paul. "What is Basic in Human Nature." Pastoral Psychology, 14 (February 1963), 13-20.

Vitz, Paul C. Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-Worship. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Watzlawick, Paul, John H. Weakland, and Richard Risch. Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution. New York: Norton, 1974.

Whitehead, Alfred North, and Betrand Russell. Principia Mathematica. 3 Vols., 2d ed. Cambridge: Harvard, c. 1910-1913, 1973.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Process and Reality. Corrected edition edited by D.R. Griffin and D.W. Sherburne, New York: Free Press, c. 1929, 1978.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Religion in the Making. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Science and the Modern World. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

Will, James E. "Implications for Philosophical Theology in Confrontation of American Personalism with Depth Psychology." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1962.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Basic Christian Affirmations." Christian Scholar, 36 (September 1953), 189-202.

Williams, Daniel Day. "God and Time." South East Asia Journal of Theology, 2 (January 1961), 7-19.

Williams, Daniel Day. God's Grace and Man's Hope. New York: Harper, 1949.

Williams, Daniel Day. "How Does God Act? An Essay in Whitehead's Metaphysics," in Eugene Freemand and William L. Reese (eds.) Process and Divinity. LaSalle: Open Court, 1964, 161-180.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Man and Human Nature," Center for Process Studies, Claremont, CA. (Mimeographed, n.d.)

Williams, Daniel Day. The Minister and the Care of Souls. New York: Harper, 1961.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Moral Obligation in Process Philosophy." Journal of Philosophy, 56 (March 12, 1959), 263-270.

Williams, Daniel Day. "The New Theological Situation." Theology Today, 24 (January 1968), 444-463.

Williams, Daniel Day. "A Philosophical Outlook," in John E. Smith (ed.) Contemporary American Philosophy. 2d Series. London: Allen and Unwin, 1970, 229-247.

Williams, Daniel Day. The Spirit and the Forms of Love. New York: Harper, 1968.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Suffering and Being in Empirical Theology," in Bernard E. Meland (ed.) The Future of Empirical Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969, 175-194.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Theological Method in Relation to Process Philosophy." (unpublished lecture notes), Center for Process Studies, Claremont, CA, 1966.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Theology and Truth." Journal of Religion, 22 (October 1942), 382-397.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Therapy and Salvation: The Dimensions of Human Need." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 15 (May 1960), 303-317.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Truth in Theological Perspective." Journal of Religion, 28 (October 1948), 242-254.

Williams, Daniel Day. What Present-Day Theologians are Thinking. New York: Harper, 1952.

Winter, Gibson. Elements for a Social Ethic. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Wise, Carroll A. The Meaning of Pastoral Care. New York: Harper, 1966.

Wise, Carroll A. Pastoral Counseling: Its Theory and Practice. New York: Harper, 1951.

Wise, Carroll A. Psychiatry and the Bible. New York: Harper, 1956.

Wise, Carroll A. Religion in Illness and Health. New York: Harper, 1942.